THE
CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CCXIV.] OCTOBER, 1862. [Vol. XVIII.

THE CHARACTER OF RICHARD BAXTER, AND HIS INFLUENCE ON THE ENSUING DEVELOPMENT OF ENGLISH NONCONFORMITY.

BEING ONE OF THE COURSE OF LECTURES RECENTLY DELIVERED IN LONDON.

BY REV. JOHN JAMES TAYLER, B.A.

Hebrews xi. 38: "Of whom the world was not worthy."

Every cause, whatever be its intrinsic worth, is ennobled by a history, when we can look at it through the mellowing light of centuries and trace it back to a living root in the distant past. Till it has borne fruit year after year and weathered many a storm, we have no sufficient evidence of its vitality. Falsehood and folly and the baseless dreams of speculative minds soon die out, and leave no deep impress on the course of human affairs or the direction of human thought. Whatever endures, what no opposition can arrest and no persecution trample down, is proved by the very fact of its simple persistency in life, to bear along with it some imperishable elements of right and truth. And if we see this must be so even in the case of abstract doctrines and outward institutions, still more must it be so in the case of religion, which has its source in the most living of this world's agencies, the utterances and endeavours of an earnest human soul. For religion spreads its sympathies through the ages, and makes successive generations one in a common trust and love. Our faith in God himself is strengthened by witnessing its manifestation in the efforts and sacrifices of noble-minded men who transmit their highest life to a long line of spiritual descendants. Then first do we truly believe in the possibility of a religious virtue, when history shews us that it has been a reality.

The antagonism of which Nonconformity is the expression, goes back to the first ages of Christianity itself, and is older than the organized Catholicism to which it is opposed. Our English Dissent is but a tributary to a broader and deeper stream which flows through the entire history of the Church—a permanent result in our social condition of the great religious strife of the 17th century. That grand, heroic period from which date all our liberties, ought never to be lost to our view. Let not the wealth and splendour and luxury of our actual civilization blind us to the momentous issue that was then at stake, or chill our gratitude to the patriots and confessors who bravely encountered it for our deliverance.—Richard Baxter is the religious

genius of that remarkable time—collecting and expressing in his own life its purest elements and highest aspirations—identified with no party, but an example to all. From his spirit are derived the noblest impulses which have animated our English Nonconformity. His was the deep human love which corrects its tendency to bitterness, and his the wide catholicity of soul which saves it from narrowness and vulgarity.

Baxter's father was a Shropshire yeoman of competent estate, one of that manly, independent class, half-way between the labourer and the gentleman, which has furnished England with some of its best intellect and sturdiest virtue. Richard was his only child. Though conforming peaceably to the Church of his ancestors, the elder Baxter was Puritanically inclined; and his son's account of his own youth gives an amusing picture of the conflict of tendencies which was already at work in the national mind. The Book of Sports, authorized by the Court, had quickened into new life the religious strictness which it wounded and scandalized. On Sundays, after common prayer, almost till it was dark, the family devotions of the Baxters were disturbed by the pipe and tabor and the dancing of the villagers round a maypole and great tree close to their own door; and Baxter confesses that in those young days the old Adam was at times too powerful for him, and "he broke loose from conscience and joined them, and the more he did it the more he was inclined to it." But his youth in all essential points was serious and pure; though his instructors appear to have been feeble and incompetent men, and he wanted, therefore, the stimulus and encouragement of a high example. When he should have gone to the University, he was placed instead under the charge of the chaplain to the Lord President of Wales, at Ludlow Castle, only a year or two before Milton's beautiful Masque of Comus was presented within the same walls. Though at this time so nearly in contact, I am not aware that these two great men have anywhere noticed each other in their writings. Baxter always regretted this change in his destination, for it occasioned deficiencies in his scholarship which the unceasing activity and pre-occupation of his ensuing life never allowed him to repair. This was not his only experience of a court life. At the advice of a friend, he went up to London with a letter of introduction to Sir Henry Herbert, Master of the Revels to King Charles I., with the intention of pushing his fortunes in that direction. But he was so disgusted at having to sit through a masque on Sunday afternoon, when he would gladly have listened to a sermon, that he soon abandoned this career, and took up again with redoubled earnestness those religious studies and contemplations to which his natural bias and the influences of his early home so strongly disposed him. For some years he taught the Free School at Dudley, devoting all his leisure hours to practical divinity; and

the commencement of his inquiries from this side of theology, is a circumstance not to be overlooked, as it probably exercised no little influence on the aim of his future labours and the ultimate cast of his religious views. In 1638, he received holy orders from the Bishop of Worcester, having at that time no scruples about conformity. It was the imposition of Laud's *et-cetera* oath, which first excited his doubts and made him suspicious of its lawfulness. But the great reforms commenced by the Long Parliament, opened before him a prospect of more freedom and more usefulness. For sixteen years, with occasional interruptions, he was the parish minister of Kidderminster; and during that time, by a steady discouragement of party spirit, and by owning and welcoming vital godliness wherever it shewed itself in men of all opinions, he acquired an extraordinary moral influence over his people, and succeeded in reforming to a wonderful extent a community previously notorious for its irreligion and wickedness. For a short time during the wars, he became chaplain to Col. Whalley's regiment in the Parliamentary army. In this situation, not only was he very active in repressing the sectaries among whom a mischievous antinomianism was prevalent, and whose tendencies he regarded as destructive and revolutionary, but he lost also the countenance of Cromwell by speaking his mind plainly as to the course of action which he saw the great Independent Captain had resolved to pursue. Baxter, indeed, throughout his career, while ever prepared to acknowledge with Christian prudence the authority of successive governments *de facto*, and rendering full justice to the enlightened toleration of Cromwell, stood firm by his attachment to the ancient Monarchy and the National Church, and dissuaded his people from committing themselves by taking either the Covenant of the Parliament or the Engagement of the Commonwealth.

At the Restoration, public attention was universally directed to him as the most eminent minister of the great Presbyterian party. And let not that word Presbyterian deceive us. It had already acquired a new meaning. Of Presbyterianism in its proper sense, as understood in Scotland and Geneva, there was then, as there has been since in this country, next to nothing of pure English growth. Let Baxter speak for himself. I quote from his Autobiography. "The greatest advantage," he says, "which I found for concord and pacification was among a great number of ministers and people who had addicted themselves to no sect or party at all, though the vulgar called them by the name of Presbyterians. And the truth is, as far as I could discover, this was the case of the greatest number of the godly ministers and people throughout England; for though Presbytery generally took in Scotland, yet it was but a stranger here." (Reliq. Baxter. I. 146.) In another passage he remarks: "According to the fashion of those times, any man that was for a

spiritual, serious way of worship (though he were for moderate episcopacy and liturgy) and that lived according to his profession, was called commonly a Presbyterian, as formerly he was called a Puritan. Of the Lords, he that was for episcopacy and the liturgy was called a Presbyterian, if he endeavoured to procure any abatement of their impositions for the reconciling of the parties, or the ease of the ministers and people that disliked them. Of the ministers, he was called a Presbyterian that was for episcopacy and liturgy, if he conformed not so far as to subscribe or swear to the English diocesan frame and all their impositions. I knew not of any one Lord at Court that was a Presbyterian; yet were the Earl of Manchester (a good man) and the Earl of Anglesea and the Lord Hollis called Presbyterians." (Ibid. I. 278.)

It was the reform, therefore, of the parochial system and the episcopal discipline after the primitive model, and not its destruction to make way for something wholly new, and foreign to the ancient usage of the country,—that was the aim of Baxter and that large influential party, constituting probably the bulk of the nation, opposed to high-flying prelatists on one hand and to separatists of various name on the other, of which, under the name of Presbyterian, he was the most emphatic mouthpiece and the most distinguished representative. A large majority of those who were ejected from their benefices by the Act of Uniformity, were men of this moderate, catholic stamp. They had naturally hoped that the return of the King would be followed by the settlement of the Church on some broad and durable basis. Baxter shared in these expectations, though he soon discovered how fallacious they were.

So long as the appearance was maintained of an intention to fulfil the promises contained in the Royal Declaration from Breda, Baxter was singled out as a special object of confidence and favour. He was in constant communication with Clarendon; was appointed one of the King's chaplains; put on the Savoy Commission for reforming the Book of Common Prayer; and offered the Bishopric of Hereford, which, suspecting a snare to his conscience, he refused, praying only that he might be restored to his beloved flock at Kidderminster. The violent reaction of popular feeling, aided by the implacable animosity of the High-churchmen, rendered utterly fruitless every plan of comprehension. If the Presbyterians, among whom Baxter was conspicuous, were unreasonably stiff on some points of minor importance, the prelatists met them with a fixed resolution not to give up a single inch of the ground which they had regained. Concessions on one side would only have led to increased demands on the other. It had been determined to eject the Presbyterians from the Church; or, if they remained within it, to brand them with the imputation of perjury and the surrender of their prin-

ciples. There is too much reason to believe, that the better feeling of the Government and even of the Court, succumbed with worldly indifference and love of ease to the overpowering malice and vindictiveness of the bishops. Baxter held no living, and could therefore suffer no ejectment. He was simply silenced; and from a feeling of respect for constituted authority and a fear lest his example should encourage others to inconsiderate conformity, he ceased from preaching three months before the Act of Uniformity took effect. When we call to mind Baxter's actuating spirit and constant aim,—how he had always preached moderation and mutual forbearance,—how he had clung to the Church and the Monarchy through all political changes,—the sufferings and losses which he had to undergo for near a quarter of a century after Bartholomew-day cry shame on the malignant hostility and flagrant injustice of the men who inflicted them. He was constantly fined and distrained, his very bed on one occasion being sold from under him; he was deprived of his library, and allowed no settled place of abode, living now at Acton, now at Totteridge, now with some friend in the country, and every now and then, when the occasional indulgences permitted it, in London. In fulfilment of the obligation which he believed was laid on him by his ordination vows, he preached the gospel of love and holiness, wherever and whenever he could, out of the canonical hours of the public service, which he regularly attended himself. But he met with encouragement and sympathy from neither of the extreme factions by which the country was torn asunder. The Church persecuted him because he pleaded for toleration and charity; the sectaries hated him because he would not join with them in their rancorous enmity to the Church. The distinguished head of the Independents, the learned Dr. Owen, though holding principles which, carried to their legitimate consequences, must have utterly upset the Anglican Establishment, passed through this stormy period with far less interruption of studious quiet and domestic comfort than Baxter, and enjoyed to the last the favour of Clarendon. Baxter constantly got himself into trouble by his outspoken plainness of speech, his single-minded honesty of purpose, his unyielding tenacity of whatever had once approved itself to his conscience as right,—by too much eagerness and subtlety in disputation, and by an utter want of that worldly tact and prudence which helps far inferior men to escape the annoyances and secure for themselves not a little of the ease and enjoyment of life. His course was harassed and agitated almost to its close. When already seventy, he was browbeaten in open court with brutal insolence by the inhuman Jefferies. Yet posterity has benefited by what he endured. It was amidst these trials that the graces of his saint-like character, its patient fortitude, its high-minded conscientiousness, its lofty trust, its large and tolerant charity, were exercised and proved.

Here it gained that rich and many-sided experience and that deep insight into the spiritual realities of life, which made his writing and his preaching so full of instruction and comfort to thousands of human souls. Though he was misunderstood and maligned by numbers of the high and the low vulgar, the best men of his age and nation admired and honoured him—a Barrow, a Wilkins, a Patrick and a Maynard; and he was compensated for much worldly discouragement by the affectionate intimacy of a select circle of distinguished friends—the wise and good Sir Matthew Hale, the philosophic Boyle, Hampden, the son of the great Parliamentary leader, and Sir Henry Ashurst, a patriotic citizen of London. Glanvil, the latitudinarian, said of him, "that he was the only man that spoke sense in an age of nonsense." Baxter married the daughter of a Shropshire country gentleman, who sympathized in his principles and shared his sacrifices, and gave him her hand after his magnanimous refusal of a bishopric. In the closing years of his life, he retired to a house in the neighbourhood of Charterhouse Square, where he gratuitously assisted the ministry of Mr. Sylvester, the first pastor of the society of Protestant Dissenters which assembled till recently in Little Carter Lane, adjoining St. Paul's, in this city. He had been a voluminous writer for nearly half a century; and the last work which came from his pen, "The Certainty of the World of Spirits," indicates the steadfastness of his faith and the unchanged direction of his thoughts to the termination of his earthly career. He died in 1691, having lived long enough to witness the practical settlement of the great controversy in which he had been so deeply involved, and to partake of the toleration for which he had so earnestly striven; but, happily for himself, not sufficiently long to experience once more the disappointment of his cherished hopes of a comprehension, which should embrace good and Christian men of various shades of opinion within the limits of one Catholic Church.

Such was Richard Baxter. What is the lesson which his example bequeaths to us? And what influence can it be shewn to have exerted on that section of English Nonconformists with which most of us are traditionally connected?

Baxter's religious convictions and the large-hearted charity into which they ever widened more and more, were the fruit not of speculation but of experience, not of converse with books but of contact with men. Like his illustrious successor in the same field of action, John Wesley, the longer he lived the less he valued mere opinions; the more clearly he saw that love and holiness were the grand essentials of the Christian life. He began indeed his career with controversy, and from controversy, when forced on him, he never shrank; but already in his first work, his "Aphorisms of Justification and the Covenants," the Calvinism is of a mitigated character, and its reasonings are

mainly directed against antinomianism. His early devotion to practical divinity, his decided adoption of the doctrine of free-will, and his leaning towards universality of redemption, imbued his theology from the first with a marked ethical tendency, which furnishes the key to the right interpretation of his multifarious writings, and suggests the fundamental unity of thought which pervades them throughout. During his ministry at Kidderminster, he preached a series of sermons to prove that selfishness is the sum and root of all positive evil. The works of which he reflected with most pleasure on being the author were such as had immediately a practical and religious design,—his "Call to the Unconverted," and his "Saint's Everlasting Rest." The last was a spontaneous outpouring of the soul, a transcript of his own spiritual experience, when he was laid aside by sickness from ministerial service, and felt himself hourly in the presence of death. For the practical fruit which it bore, as witnessed to him by the acknowledgment of multitudes, it was one of the most successful of his books. "I found," says he, "that the transcript of the heart hath the greatest force on the hearts of others." To bring forth practical godliness out of a religious heart, was the one aim of his ministry. To this work he felt himself specially consecrated. The watchings and exhortations and prayers of months, he thought abundantly rewarded by the conversion of one human soul to God. A human soul in his sight had a value above all price. Hence the searching depth and subduing power of his ministrations. They were inspired by a profound sense of the grandeur of their object. Though he was richly cultured and had a natural gift of eloquence, he neglected the literary fame which with a more self-seeking devotion to that object he might easily have won. The opportunity of direct and positive usefulness outweighed with him every other consideration. The books and tracts which he was continually putting forth of every description and on all subjects, were for the most part occasional and thrown off at a heat. During the Plague, he placarded the walls of London with directions for the treatment of the sick and warnings to the ungodly; and on other occasions circulated half-sheets for the use of families to whom larger books were unsuitable or inaccessible. He confesses himself that he had written too much and too fast; but the very negligence and looseness of his style, when we recollect what occasioned it, is seasoned with a kind of moral savour, and fills us, as we read, with a deeper reverence for the man. One thus intent on practical goodness, was not likely to trouble himself much about opinions which he could not perceive were essential to a Christian life. His aim was to gather all he could into the fold of his Master, without undue strictness of exclusion. The outward, credible signs of seriousness of mind and honesty of purpose, sufficed with him for

admission. If answering a test like this, he would not have directly shut out even Papists or Socinians, nor was he without hope for heathens themselves. When we remember the predominant spirit of his age, we can estimate the depth of charity which could yield a concession like this. "I can never believe," he says, "that a man may not be saved by that religion which doth but bring him to the true love of God and to a heavenly mind and life; nor that God will ever cast a soul into hell that truly loveth him." He regarded love as the first of Christian graces, the choicest fruit of Christian trial and experience. His language on this topic is always singularly beautiful. "That is the way of God," he writes in a letter to a friend, "that is the way of love, and that to be much suspected that quencheth it. What a mellow sweetness doth the way of love communicate to all the duties and conversings of those that are abounding in this grace! It is the manhood and maturity of Christianity. The infancy of the law had less of it than the full age of the gospel; and young Christians usually are like young fruit, austere and unpleasant, whom age and holy experience must mellow by the growth of love, produced by the sunshine of heavenly love."

In this spirit of love his whole ministry was conducted; and on the catholic principle which it dictated, would he have had the Church reformed. In the Association of Worcestershire Ministers which he gathered together during his settlement at Kidderminster, he tells us that the mass were "mere Catholics; men of no faction, nor siding with any party, but owning that which was good in all,"—"laying themselves out for the great end of their ministry, the people's edification."

Turning now to the more intellectual side of his nature, we find here, too, large matter for admiration. He was far in advance of the narrow scripturalism of the Puritan party, and had not a few points of affinity with the latitudinarianism of Cudworth, More and Smith. His scholarship was confessedly defective. In this respect he will not admit of a comparison with his very learned contemporary, Dr. Owen. Of Greek and Hebrew he had only an imperfect knowledge. But his reading within the range of the Latin and English tongues was vast and multifarious. His attention was particularly drawn to the higher and more abstruse questions of morals and metaphysics; and one of his principal works, the "Christian Directory," contained a systematic solution of cases of conscience. He had studied deeply the scholastic divines of the middle ages, and was more familiar with Aquinas, Durandus and Scotus, than with the older writers of the Church, whose works, requiring a more exact philology for their interpretation, he had not an equal power of critically mastering. Two effects resulted from this direction of his studies. On the one hand, it exercised his dialectic faculty to excess, and che-

rished an undue fondness for refined and subtle distinctions, which at times broke out in disputatiousness; on the other, it had the inestimable advantage of carrying his thoughts deep into the interior structure of the human soul, and enabled him to seize clearly and firmly the fundamental postulates and immutable conditions of all religious truth. He saw that Christianity in its essence was rather a power acting on the heart and the conscience, than a mere question of outward evidence determinable by the understanding; that its hold on the human mind was in one sense anterior to, and independent of, its record in a book. Again and again he had to remind his bibliolatrous contemporaries, that there was a Christianity before there was a New Testament. He encountered the sceptic on this very ground, maintaining that the true order of proceeding was, "to try the truth of the Christian religion first and the perfect verity of all the Scriptures afterwards." In fact, he argued this point with so much freedom and boldness, that he was charged with a Popish tendency to exalt tradition at the expense of scripture. In the same strain he contended that "he who was ignorant of the law of nature, would be ignorant and erroneous in the holy Scriptures." In one of the most remarkable passages of his "Life and Times," he has distinguished the gradations of certainty that attach to different religious truths; and here, amidst a crowd of rich, suggestive thoughts, occur these memorable words: "I am now much more apprehensive than heretofore of the necessity of well grounding men in their religion, and especially of the witness of the indwelling spirit; for I more sensibly perceive that the spirit is the great witness of Christ and Christianity to the world; and though the folly of fanatics tempted me long to overlook the strength of this testimony of the spirit, while they placed it in a certain internal assertion or enthusiastic inspiration, yet now I see that the Holy Ghost, in another manner, is the witness of Christ and his agent in the world. The spirit in the prophets was his first witness; and the spirit by miracles was the second; and the spirit by renovation, sanctification, illumination and consolation, assimilating the soul to Christ and heaven, is the continued witness to all true believers. If any man have not the spirit of Christ, the same is none of his."

With the highest appreciation of real scholarship, Baxter saw clearly that there were some truths the sense of which mere learning could not give, and the most learned often miss. In his "Dying Thoughts," written at the close of life, in daily expectation of death, when the hand of persecution lay heavy upon him, he says, with the evident intensity of conviction which such circumstances were fitted to inspire: "There is a great difference between that light which sheweth us the thing itself, and that artificial skill by which we have right notions, names and

definitions. This artificial kind of knowledge is good and useful in its kind; but he that hath much of this, may have little of the former; and unlearned persons that have little of this, may have more of the former, and may have those inward perceptions of the verity of the promises and rewards of God, which they cannot bring forth in artificial reasonings to themselves or others; who are taught of God by the effective sort of teaching, which reacheth the heart or will as well as the understanding, and is a giving of what is taught, and a making us such as we are told we must be."

Baxter's religious opinions, the result of deep early impressions, shaped and qualified by the various experience through which he had passed, are not very easy to define. Probably they were not at all points self-consistent, nor even to his own eye circumscribed by a very distinct outline. They seem to have lain in a sort of vague mean between Calvinism and Arminianism; and this is not at all surprising, when we recollect that his life in its mental experience was a transitional one, ever travelling onward, almost unconsciously, from a narrow Calvinism into a broader Arminianism. His views, however, had great influence on the ensuing generation of Nonconformist divines, and for a long time were considered as forming a system by themselves, called Baxterianism. In more than one respect, they resembled those of the early Quakers, opposed as he was to their outward discipline and to their fanatical separation from national churches. Like them, he held that all men have a *common* grace offered them, sufficient to secure by its faithful use the *special* grace essential to salvation. In this sense, he believed in *election*, while he denied *reprobation*. The essential worth of his system consisted in the stress which it laid on the inward conversion of the soul to God, on the quality of men's affections towards God and towards each other, on the necessity of some deeper change in the heart and will through the effectual working of the divine spirit, than such as merely sufficed by a prudential calculation of consequences to produce an outward decency of moral conduct. His style is now antiquated; his works little read; and the deep questions which he mooted have assumed another form in our modern schools; but there are passages in his writings which still speak with unaltered and irresistible force to the religious consciousness of our nature. The celebrated Arthur Young, a man of large culture and well acquainted with the world, was an habitual student and great admirer of Baxter, and shewed the value that he attached to his religious instructions by publishing a very interesting selection from his practical works.

At the time of the Revolution, when our Protestant Dissenting churches first acquired a legal constitution under the Toleration Act, the Nonconformists generally might be divided into

two great classes, the Calvinists and the Baxterians. The former, who acknowledged Dr. Owen as their head, embraced, with a few exceptions, the Independents, who had become very numerous and powerful under the Commonwealth, and still retained among them some ancient families. Their governing aim was the preservation of what they called pure churches, each constituting an ecclesiastical whole within itself, held together by attachment to a rigid doctrinal standard, and less remarkable for an ethical interpretation of Christianity and broad catholic sympathies than for a separating strictness of belief and discipline. The Baxterians comprehended the bulk of the old Presbyterian party, who for half a century, under their illustrious leader, had distinguished themselves by an exaltation of the spirit of Christianity above the doctrinal or disciplinary forms of any particular church. Their animating principle was the instinct, if I may so call it, of catholicity and progressive spiritual development. They left the Church, not from any hostility to it as such, not from any aversion to wide ecclesiastical communion, but because the Church by its actual constitution repressed the natural and healthy expansion of these generous tendencies and noble aspirations. Baxter is the founder of this type of English Nonconformity. Presbyterianism is its historical designation; and I have already shewn, by extracts from his writings, that the term had just as much appropriateness, or, if you choose, just as much inappropriateness, in his days as in our own. Let us not wrangle about words, if we can only seize and keep the thing. The name with all its associations has come down to us. For my part, I rejoice in our religious ancestry; and I accept with reverence the heritage of its traditions and its responsibilities. It was a noble bequest,—so noble, that a cold, dry, materialistic and utilitarian age could neither understand its worth nor fulfil its purpose. Not yet are the obligations which it lays upon us exhausted. Preserving the free spirit of our forefathers without blind and servile adhesion to their forms of thought, we must still press on, in the reverent and loving temper of Baxter himself, under the spreading light of science and with the aids of a deeper and wider learning, towards a more complete realization to our minds, and a more perfect expression in our lives, of the vital religiousness which is hidden in the person and work of Christ, and which will carry us, through union with him, into still higher union with his Father and our own. It was unfortunate for the growth and ripening of Baxter's catholic system, that the seeds of it fell in the first instance on the cold and barren soil of the eighteenth century. All the influences of that ungenial time were hostile to religious fervour and profound spirituality of mind; and Baxterianism wanted the clearly defined doctrinal views and the sharp points of antagonism to co-existing systems, which seem

indispensable, in the absence of strong religious life, to the perpetuation and extension of a mere sect. Even the philosophy of Locke, with all its merits, impressed an undue rationalizing tendency on the scientific theology of the age, which subsisted to the close of the century. Baxter combined in his own person the two essential conditions of a true theology, scientific culture of the intellect and deep religiousness of heart. But these elements were divided among his descendants and drawn into different spheres. If we except Berkeley in the Church and Doddridge among the Dissenters, nearly all the theologians of scientific mark in the last century were distinguished by a cold, intellectual type of mind. It pervaded alike the learned ministers of the Nonconformists and the learned divines of the Establishment. If the tendency culminated in the manly and intrepid, but somewhat arid, intellect of Priestley, it was because his position allowed him more freedom, and his spirit was more thoroughly honest and independent. Religious fervour, and perhaps a clearer insight into the spiritual needs of the human soul, were abandoned to the Wesleys, and found an expression in the contagious sympathy which they kindled both within and without the National Church. Far be it from me to undervalue the exertions and sacrifices of the noble-minded confessors of unpopular doctrinal truth, the Priestleys and the Belshams of a former day. They did their work, as they understood it, bravely; they spoke out the truth, as it revealed itself to them, fearlessly. They deserve our reverence and are gone to their reward. But looking at our Nonconformity from a broad historical point of view, I cannot deny that it seems to me to have been beneficially brought back from the narrow doctrinal ground to which less than half a century ago there was some danger of its being exclusively confined, to the broader and nobler basis on which Baxter himself would have placed it, by the influence of Dr. Channing and his school. It is the function of an enlightened Nonconformity not so much to propagate a particular dogma as to assert a general principle. Avowing fearlessly and without reserve whatever may be our deliberate convictions for the time being, let us feel it the special strength and glory of our Nonconformity to be the inheritors of a principle which permits us to avow them, and which would equally permit us to abandon them, if others should seem to our riper judgments and wider views more correspondent to the true meaning and purpose of Christianity. This is a noble responsibility, but it is an arduous one. Renouncing the proper agency of a sect, we are still forbidden by conscience to lose ourselves in the wide communion of the National Church. Our duties and our difficulties alike result from the peculiarity of this exceptional position. We have to preserve our ecclesiastical individuality without forfeiting our catholicity. We cannot maintain ourselves amidst the

rivalry of sects without a deep and fervid religious life, and the earnest devotion of our energies to the spiritual redemption of the great mass of human misery and wickedness. We cannot justify our position to the Church, without exercising to the full our hereditary freedom of thought and speech, and keeping up in our ministry the high standard of mental and learned culture which will enable us on fitting occasions to encounter undismayed in the cause of truth and honesty, the accomplished champions of the Established system. This, as I understand it, is our proper work, as Nonconformists of the school of Baxter. Undoubtedly it demands efforts and sacrifices. But where is the object worth living for, that does not demand effort and sacrifice? Let us only think of the intrinsic worth and nobleness of our cause—a cause which allies us in aim and endeavour with the best and wisest of former generations. They have committed it to our keeping. Let us not be unfaithful to the charge; but hand it down, with an unweakened consciousness of solemn and glorious responsibility, to those who are to come after us.

THE LATE FREDERICK LUCAS.*

It is not the least of the uses of biography that, if executed in good faith and with moderate skill, it helps to rebuke our intolerance, to wean us from our antipathies, and to teach us the wisdom of a far-sighted and large-hearted charity. A good biography compels us to look on controverted topics from the *standpoint* of its subject. It enables us in one case to understand how a man, lacking neither intelligence nor goodness, has reached conclusions very different from our own on questions involving individual virtue or the general welfare. We are enabled in another case to separate a man from his errors, and can assign to accidental associations, or defective training, or imperfect logical processes, results which, without this knowledge, we might assign to wilful corruption and malignity. We have seldom met with a work which better illustrates the moral use of biography we have indicated than this by Mr. Riethmüller. To the mass of English Protestants, Frederick Lucas was a name that awakened neither respect nor curiosity. He was known as a Catholic pervert,—a man, in fact, who had boxed the compass of theological opinion,—as one who, educated in the freest Protestantism of England, had used his powers to uphold mediæval Popery,—and, though an Englishman by birth, had become the advocate and

* Frederick Lucas: a Biography. By Christopher James Riethmüller, Author of "Teuton, a Poem." Cr. 8vo. Pp. 129. London—Bell and Daldy. 1862.

representative of one of the most intolerant anti-Anglican constituencies of Ireland.

Without concealing any one fact of the singular story he has to tell, Mr. Riethmüller has succeeded not merely in awakening our interest in the character of his friend, but also, we think, in satisfying every impartial reader that the late Mr. Lucas was a man of fine natural gifts and endued with a larger share of moral graces than falls to the lot of most public men. He owes his success not to the elaborateness of his apology for his friend's eccentricities—for the whole is contained in a little volume not much exceeding 100 pages—but to his own warm personal sympathies, his fearless truth-telling, his remarkable tact in untwisting a coil of thoughts and motives which to a common observer would have seemed hopelessly tangled, and the literary skill by which he has succeeded in conveying his own convictions to the minds of his readers. We have spoken of his personal sympathies with his friend; they were simply *personal*, for he shared neither the religious nor the political faith of Mr. Lucas. Himself a Protestant and a member of the Church of England, and also, if we rightly surmise, a liberal in politics, but of that class which seeks rather good government than the supremacy of this party or that minister, he has succeeded in drawing a vigorous and unmistakeable (and at the same time attractive) portrait of one who in religion and politics was his entire opposite.

Frederick Lucas, who proved for several years the ablest lay champion of the Roman Catholic party in this country, was born March 30, 1812, in the city of London. His father was a Quaker corn-merchant. His mother was also a member of the Society of Friends. He was brought up in accordance with the straight and narrow usages and notions of that respectable body. He went to the noted Quaker school at Darlington; but eight years of the painful discipline of that establishment could not put out the fires that were already kindling in his moral and intellectual being. From the first, his abilities began to attract attention and to give promise of after excellence. How we wish his biographer had told us (if he could) something of the discipline of that Quaker gymnasium! We have always felt considerable pity for Quaker boys and girls. How unspeakably oppressive to young persons (unless, indeed, they are born with a difference from the rest of the human race) must the training be necessary to make a proper Quaker! That immoveable and undemonstrative calmness, that wary shrewdness, that habitual repression of every human emotion, which mark the full-fledged Friend, must cost as much painful discipline as the equally strange teachings of the disciples of Loyola. From Darlington school, Frederick Lucas, then in his seventeenth year, was sent to University College, London. If his parents designed him to walk through life in Quaker ways, this was a great practical

mistake. Some branches of the orthodox Dissenters have tried the experiment of committing their sons, and the candidates for their ministry amongst them, to this Babel of sects and opinions, and their experience has proved it dangerous to a sound faith and that contractedness of sympathy without which it seems difficult to keep a man in the grooves of some of our religious parties.

It was in the class-rooms of University College that Frederick Lucas and his biographer met. This is the description which the latter gives of the Quaker student in 1828:

"Though extremely shy at this period, as might have been expected from his having hitherto been confined to a narrow circle, there was something singularly engaging in his look and manner. With a remarkably fair complexion, a cheek glowing with health, a broad, open forehead, very light hair and eye-brows, and eyes of the clearest blue, there was such an expression of intelligence and frank good-nature about the whole countenance, as could not fail to inspire a friendly interest in all who saw him. His figure was large beyond his years, very stout, broad-shouldered, and broad-chested, and gave the impression of rude health and vigour. His smile was the sweetest, his laugh the most exhilarating, that I have ever met with; and the shyness mentioned above soon wore off in the company of young men, and was replaced by an easy gaiety of demeanour, that was delightful to all his associates. Long afterwards, however, he remained silent and reserved in the presence of strangers, and seldom addressed a lady without blushing. There was indeed a bashfulness, an almost girlish modesty about him, which strikingly contrasted with the strength and manliness of his character, and with that dauntless courage for which he was at all times distinguished. When he began to speak, he at once commanded attention. Even at that early age, he had acquired a large amount of miscellaneous knowledge, and had learned to express original views in fluent and forcible language. But his conversation was, perhaps, chiefly characterized by a constant flow of rich and genial humour, which held on its course so naturally, and with so little effort, that the listener was carried away imperceptibly by it, and caught the joyous contagion almost before he was aware of it."—Pp. 6—8.

It needed no prophet's skill to foretel that Frederick Lucas would never as a man "cabin crib confine" his soul to the narrowness of Quaker usages and thoughts. The quick intellect to which a university training was giving varied nourishment, the taste and habit of multifarious reading, the keen ambition of distinction in the athletic contests of his college companions, the intellectual and moral stimulus and discipline of the debating society, his love of art, his taste for music,—all these things, no less than the forbidden fruit of the theatre (which he soon tasted), indicated that the time was not far distant when Frederick Lucas would put aside the strait coat and throw off the broad brim of his sect. A portrait of him, debating in the Literary and Philosophical Society of University College, as

drawn by his biographer, shews us in the youth the father of the man.

"From the first, Frederick Lucas took a leading part in almost every discussion, and had even then acquired a power of sustained and consecutive reasoning, a readiness in reply, a command of language and illustration, and altogether a weighty and solid style of eloquence, rare at any age, and certainly very remarkable in so young a man. But he had also here the opportunity of displaying certain other peculiarities of mind and character, which remained with him through life, and which serve to explain many portions of his subsequent career.

"For instance, he never took up a subject *by halves*. Whatever was the matter in hand, he followed a proposition to its extreme consequences, and often accepted conclusions that seemed very remote from his first starting-point. It was sometimes impossible to trace the process by which he arrived at an opinion; but, when he had once formed it, he held it with a tenacity, and defended it with a vehemence, which astonished and confounded less ardent natures. For the time, it appeared to take possession of his whole being, until displaced by some other train of thought, which had also originated entirely from within. Thus he adopted in succession many different theories, on each of which he brought to bear, for a season, all the resources of his intellect, and all the energy of his feelings.

"While engaged in upholding the favourite thesis, every argument in its favour gained constantly in strength and clearness, and every opposing consideration was torn to pieces, and trampled under foot. Nor was this the ingenuity of an advocate, careless of truth, and eager for victory. It was rather the intense conviction of a most earnest, and yet most subtle mind, which united the fervour of an enthusiast with the acuteness of a logician. For, beneath the cheerful good-nature, the genial kindness, the practical moderation and fairness in his dealings with his fellows, and the modest estimate of his own worth, lay concealed in his inmost heart the tumultuous and fiery emotions which often belong to genius, but are also akin to fanaticism. These, acting through the imagination, coloured and influenced all his opinions, but never disturbed for a moment his mastery over his intellectual weapons. Pity or indignation might be the real source of his views on any particular subject, but he always knew how to find reasons for them, such as not only satisfied his own mind, but went a long way towards convincing the minds of others. What has been said of Burke, that he formed his opinions like a fanatic, and then defended them like a philosopher, was, I think, eminently true of Lucas. It was so, I believe, in his boyish days, and it supplies the key to much that might otherwise seem strange and inexplicable in his after life."—Pp. 11—13.

The Catholic claims at that time stirred all that was active in intellect and generous in feeling of the youth of England, and Lucas claimed for his Roman Catholic fellow-subjects the rights they sought, not on their ground, but "in the name of the great principles of Protestantism, free thought and free worship." A change was soon to come over the spirit of his dream.

Mr. Reithmüller, in the opening paragraph of his volume, alludes to the dreams of the early supporters of University Col-

lege (then styled the London University), who anticipated for it "a brilliant career, that should rival or eclipse the triumphs of the ancient scholastic establishment" (establishments?) "of the land." The history of the mind and of the public career of Frederick Lucas, an alumnus of the new institution, possessing far more than average ability, is not of a kind to enhance our admiration of the education given in University College. It did not fail, we may admit, in communicating to this pupil at least a certain amount of knowledge, but in the more essential quality of training his mind and fitting it to reach safe and wise conclusions it did little. Had Frederick Lucas learnt in the lecture-rooms of University College the true philosophy of history, or a consistent and practical system of mental and moral philosophy, or a thorough code of political economy, many of his after vacillations and errors might have been prevented. He would not have been, what this biography shews him to have been, a navigator steering without compass and without knowledge of the ocean on which he was embarked. We by no means intend to intimate that the subjects which we have named did not form portions of the academic course of instruction professedly given in the University, but practically they were not taught. Had professors with the requisite powers filled these chairs, they would in time have attracted around them a sufficient crowd of pupils. At that time there were no degrees given, and the college instruction was not, what it now too much is, a system of teaching to enable the student to pass successfully certain prescribed examinations for degrees. There was then none of that auxiliary *cramming*, which is most injurious to the literary and moral digestion of the unfortunate pupil, who thereby loses sight of the more important ends of a just and well-balanced education, and supposes that, when he has attained his Bachelor's or Master's degree, his education is completed. The University of Oxford, trammelled as it is by old habits and prejudices, seems to do more in the way of teaching young men to *think* than some of the modern institutions with greater pretensions to freedom and to a better cycle of instruction. But we will venture to hope that the day of reform in University College is not very distant.

On leaving the University, he entered on the study of the law. From law he proceeded to jurisprudence, and gave himself up for a time to the influence of the writings of Jeremy Bentham. Mr. Riethmüller smiles at his temporary adoption of the *utilitarian* philosophy in politics. But had Mr. Lucas in reality comprehended that principle of Bentham's which the great jurist drew from Priestley, of "the greatest happiness of the greatest number," he would have been saved from all those errors, practical as well as theoretical, into which he was seduced by that mediæval sentimentalism, in gratifying which he seemed to fling away every principle and aspiration of his youth.

The mind of Frederick Lucas was one of great activity, amounting almost to restlessness, rather than of strength and solidity. He could always argue cleverly, but not always judge wisely. The judgment of to-day did not necessarily affect that of to-morrow. He did not care to make the truth which his mind accepted agree and coalesce with previous truth. With equal intellectual passion he flung himself into successive and not consistent trains of thought, and was the equally enthusiastic disciple of masters wholly opposed in philosophy.

The philosophy of Bentham was presently made to give way to the poetry of Wordsworth, an author whom he read and reread with passionate enthusiasm.

And now the change in his faith, which was an inevitable necessity to an impulsive, earnest, but changeable nature like his, began to operate. The views of the Friends were now manifestly, to his awakened mind and feeling, "narrow and puritanical." The reaction was, in the first instance, to scepticism; but in this his poetical and excitable mind could not rest. "The dreary haze of religious doubt and negation grew intolerable to him, and he sought with a passionate earnestness to harmonize the claims of faith and reason." Two distinguished writers in metaphysics belonging to the Church of England were the authorities under whose influence Lucas escaped from his unbelief, Berkeley and Butler. The *Analogy of Religion* of the latter divine, by shewing him that the difficulties which adhered to revelation were not peculiar to it, but affected equally natural religion, in his case brought him back to the acceptance of revealed religion. In opposition to the enthusiastic admiration of Bishop Butler's philosophy and train of argument common in England at least, there have not been wanting those who have looked upon the argument as of a dangerous kind, and liable to conduct to one of two extremes, either to total disbelief or to the acceptance of a faith irreconcilable with reason and experience. That it had the latter effect in the case of Mr. Lucas is more than probable. His biographer hints at his afterwards straining the line of Butler's argument to the utmost, and applying it unreasonably to forced and fanciful resemblances.

Again a believer, Lucas found himself for a time an unattached Christian.

"If he continued nominally a member of the Society of Friends, he was no doubt influenced by habit and association, as well as by the feeling, that he could follow his own convictions as freely in that body as in any other. Its abstinence from creeds and dogmatic teaching would, of course, be a recommendation to him, and I have often heard him speak approvingly of that silent worship, which, however strange it may appear to others, has a solemn significance for those who have been accustomed to it from childhood."—P. 24.

To an imaginative and active mind, the silent worship would

certainly have this recommendation, that it did not bring down the shower of words which were not the symbols of thought, or of which the thought was slight and unreal and not worth regard; but more especially was it advantageous to the uninterrupted pursuit by a worshiper like Lucas of the thoughts that breathe.

In 1835, Mr. Lucas was called to the bar. He designed to devote himself to conveyancing. But literature and theology soon proved to him more attractive than the pursuit of wealth and professional eminence. Macaulay and Carlyle now were admitted into the circle of his favourite authors; but the good sense and practical wisdom of the former had not on his enthusiastic mind equal influence with the wild reverence of power which breaks forth so strangely in most of the writings of the latter. The biographer says that the writings of the author of *Sartor Resartus* left an ineffaceable impression on the mind of Mr. Lucas, and adds,

"It is not too much to say that they contributed *indirectly* to the change of creed of which I am about to treat, for the sympathies they called forth were all in favour of the Middle Ages, and they pointed to a revival of Faith as the panacea for the ills of humanity."—P. 30.

Mr. Riethmüller gives a powerful description of the Puseyite revival of the Church of England which arose at Oxford some thirty years back, and which he regards simply as "a part of that strong recoil from the irreverence and unbelief of the eighteenth century, which had already made itself felt, in some shape or other, in all the nations of Teutonic descent."

The description of Mr. Lucas's final change of religious opinions we must give in the language of his biographer:

"To all this stir about him Lucas was fully awake, for it corresponded with what was going on in his own mind. He too had struggled through doubts and difficulties back to the faith of his childhood, but as yet could find no resting-place in any outward communion, and, dissatisfied with the present, had begun to turn fondly towards the past. The history and traditions of mediæval Christianity had a great charm for his imagination, and he threw himself heart and soul into the study of those subjects. His feelings and his fancy soon acted insensibly on his judgment, and those, who observed him closely, could not fail to perceive, that his opinions were once more undergoing a gradual, but important change."—Pp. 32, 33.

"But now came an interval of painful uncertainty. Every day led him further from Quakerism, and nearer to the historical Christianity of the ages in which he took so deep an interest, but he still retained some of his old Protestant feelings with regard to the Church of Rome. He doubted her claim to infallibility, for he still believed her in many things corrupt. Her antique forms, her solemn services, her venerable traditions, had a great charm for him; he longed for communion with the good and pious men of distant countries and bygone generations, and for those sweet and awful memories which unite the living with the dead in a chain of unbroken association; but he shrank from at once condemn-

ing all the convictions of his previous life, and he hesitated to accept an authority, from which there could be no appeal.

"The natural solution of these difficulties seemed to lie in the Church of England, and some of his friends entertained the hope that he would yet find rest within her walls."—P. 45.

In a glowing passage, Mr. Riethmüller pictures the Church of England and its attractions to a reverent yet free and inquiring mind. In his representation, the Church is said to give "more latitude to opinion than any other Church in existence,"—to be "Catholic in feeling, and Protestant in the free spirit of rational inquiry,"—a Church that leaves "many questions unsettled, and many points dubious, so that she may preach the great truths of the gospel in their simplest and broadest sense." The picture is attractive, and we do not question the good faith of the artist. Nay, we are ready to admit that multitudes of the laity, and a few wise and liberal men among the clergy, do what in them lies to make the picture a reality. But with the symbols and articles of the Church of England in our recollection, we are compelled to think that the latitudinarian party in the Church are liberal not by, but in spite of, their Church.

Our biographer thinks that what is to his own mind the recommendation of the Church of England, "her singular moderation and wise spirit of compromise," would prove no recommendation of it to the mind of Lucas. To him, compromise seemed "a cowardly abandonment of truth for the sake of expediency." What he wanted was something on which to rest his faith, definite and absolute. Had he consented to enter the communion of the Church of England, it is the belief of his biographer that he would have attached himself to one of her extreme parties.

But from the Evangelical party he was repelled by their narrow and puritanical spirit, by their depreciation of ecclesiastical history and tradition, by the undue prominence they gave to the minister, and the importance they attached to mere human teaching. (These were certainly strange objections in the mouth of one about to join a Church in which through its sacraments the power of life eternal is given to the priest!) He also felt strong repugnance to the fiery spirit of intolerance and misrepresentation to which the Catholic Church is subjected by the Evangelical party.

The old High-church party failed to excite his confidence. He respected their learning and their personal virtues; but he objected they were scholars rather than divines, that they preferred learning to piety, and were content with a merely formal execution of their office, were indifferent in matters of theology, and generally stagnant in religious ideas.

To the Puseyite party at Oxford, Lucas felt strong attractions; accepting, however, their premises, he blamed them for faltering in the inevitable conclusion. He did not feel that their idea,

which he accepted, of the Church could be realized in the Church of England.

Thus did he revolve the characteristics of the Church of England:

"Whatever she had retained of stately forms and ancient usages, whatever of Catholic sentiment she had derived from the past, whatever deference she might pay to the authority of Councils and Fathers—he could not help feeling that she was, in her nature, essentially Protestant, and that, from the moment she had separated from Rome, she had really based her title to respect and allegiance, not on any power inherent in her own constitution, but on a sound, and reasonable, and honest interpretation of Scripture, and a faithful adherence to the broad principles of the Christian faith. But this, Lucas would argue, involved an appeal to the right of private judgment, as distinctly as the unauthorized preaching of any obscure sect, and in no way came up to that grand idea of a Church, gifted with divine graces, and armed with supernatural powers. The true Protestant, who was willing to work out painfully his own salvation, by the light of Scripture, and the guidance of God's Spirit, with such little help as he might get from men wiser or better than himself, but with no thought that he could ever shift the responsibility for a moment from his own shoulders, might be content with a Church that could only afford him advice, assistance, and consolation." Pp. 56, 57.

Mr. Lucas, conducted thus by the Anglican school to the road which led to the Church of Rome, soon went on to the end of his journey; and being convinced of the claims of the Romish Church to his faith and subjection, spurned the counsels of his friends that he should hesitate and re-consider, and openly professed the change. He proceeded to vindicate his adhesion to the Church of Rome in a pamphlet addressed to the Quaker body. Of that production, judging by the extracts adduced, we may say that it contains arguments neither weaker nor stronger than those which have been a hundred times adduced for the abandonment of reason and inquiry, and in deference to a Church that calls itself infallible. It may, however, receive the praise of being more lively and eloquent than most Catholic homilies that have fallen in our way.

Mr. Riethmüller's criticism on the pamphlet is this:

"The line of argument pursued is almost entirely negative, and indeed of considerable force as a reply to specific objections; and such is the general tone of reasoning throughout the treatise. It does not pretend to offer any positive exposition or defence of the Catholic doctrines, but rather attempts to show how they may be reconciled with views and feelings which are already familiar to Protestants, and especially to Quakers. Taken in this sense, it is undoubtedly an impressive and powerful piece of writing."—P. 72.

The religious history of Frederick Lucas shews that the doctrine of the inward light in which he had been trained, is not always the steady bulwark of faith which some who have adopted

it love to represent it. His mind panted for a faith resting on the firm supports of an historical basis. As this was not supplied to him by his early instructors, he gave himself up to scepticism. A mind like his could, however, find no resting-place in a system of doubt and negation. He returned of necessity to faith of some kind, and found it in conjunction with a Church which trusts for its credentials neither to inward spiritual breathings, nor to the interpretations of scripture, nor to the calm deductions of reason; but which, claiming absolute infallibility, treats as equally worthless the fancies of the mystic and the arguments of the rational scripturalist. It is, we admit, dangerous to draw any large conclusion from a single example. Did the case of Mr. Lucas stand alone, it might be regarded as anomalous. But his is not the only instance known to literature of a Quaker swinging round to Popery. And we fear the combination of the Quaker doctrine of the "God within" with disbelief of the Christian revelation, is a case still less uncommon.

With the history of Mr. Lucas's conversion, the interest of the biography all but terminates. Mr. Lucas became almost immediately after so united and identified with the history and vicissitudes of the Roman Catholic party in England and Ireland, that the writing of his life would of necessity diffuse itself into a history of his party. To a subject of this kind and of such wide proportions Mr. Riethmüller felt no attraction, and probably had no qualification for such an undertaking. The few incidents that remain to tell of Mr. Lucas were these.

In 1840, he established the *Tablet*, a Roman Catholic journal, and for fifteen years he continued to edit it and to write all its principal articles. During several of its early years, while Lucas resided in London and took counsel with English as well as Irish Catholics, we had the opportunity of seeing it, and well remember its vigorous tone, its often acute logic, its quickness in perceiving and its dexterity in piercing any weak point in the armour of Protestant opponents. It was also characterized by an earnestness which bespoke its editor's unwavering faith in the Church of his adoption. Many of its purely literary articles were of a better order than commonly appear in our religious journals, and sometimes reminded one of the critical labours of the *Examiner* and the *Spectator*.

In 1840, Mr. Lucas married a lady brought up in the Society of Friends, but who in the course of a not short engagement had been brought to consent to share the faith as well as the fortunes of her lover.

Mr. Lucas was not without his troubles in respect to his own party. He spoke out his own opinions on all subjects unflinchingly, and those opinions sometimes crossed and thwarted the policy of other leaders of the Catholic party, especially in England. His constitutional dislike of the *juste milieu*, his resolute-

ness in following out the logical conclusion to which his reason led him, sometimes brought on painful collisions. The failure of the capitalists on whom the *Tablet* originally rested, brought him troubles not a few. He was aided in this emergency by funds subscribed by his party, and by the personal influence of Mr. O'Connell. Ultimately, in 1849, he found it necessary to remove his place of publication and his residence to Dublin. Here a thousand annoyances awaited him, growing out of the careless and reckless habits of subordinates in the *Tablet* office.

Mr. Lucas now became the adviser of the Irish party, and mingled in all their councils and fought their battles. The burthen was one that of necessity increased year by year. The more he was known and trusted by his brother Catholics, the greater the labour and responsibility they threw upon him. His public life in Ireland reached its climax in 1852, when he was returned, after a contest, at the head of the poll as one of the representatives for the county of Meath. Entering Parliament without personal friends in that body to counsel and support him, and also with the painful suspicion in the minds of those who knew little about him that he was a mere political adventurer, he succeeded, by the force of his abilities and by his earnestness of purpose, in making for himself a fair position in the House of Commons.

"It is creditable to Englishmen, that their strongest antipathies do not prevent their giving a patient hearing to an adversary, if he has really anything to say, and from the moment that Lucas first rose to address the House, he was listened to without interruption. It was not long, indeed, before the cloud of prejudice against him began to disperse. His very look and manner, suggestive rather of some stalwart Kentish yeoman, than of Irish rapparee or Popish conspirator, told at once on the assembled Commons. The portly figure, the frank, fair, Saxon countenance, the genial smile, the glance of kindly humour, the unaffected and manly bearing, were sure to impress an English audience in his favour; and when it was found that he brought to every subject, of which he treated, considerable knowledge of detail, great skill in arranging his facts, and the power of putting a statement in the clearest light, accompanied by a flow of language and illustration, which rose often to eloquence, while none who saw and heard him could doubt for an instant of his sincerity—the former hostility and suspicion were replaced by something like interest and sympathy. Ministers and leaders of party accosted him in words of compliment, and the House granted him that respectful attention which is the highest praise from political opponents. Personally, he became almost popular; and I believe it is no exaggeration to say, that, before he had been many months in parliament, the only feeling with which he was regarded by those who differed from him most widely, was one of regret that so gifted and amiable a man should be engaged in such a cause."—Pp. 111, 112.

Mr. Lucas was always honest as day, and it was one of his painful duties to oppose and expose some amongst his party who, he had reason to think, were of an opposite character.

In 1854, the Irish priesthood were warned by a high ecclesiastical authority to abstain from interference in political affairs. This was personally a heavy blow to the interests of the *Tablet*. Mr. Lucas looked to the priesthood as his most influential friends. He held that the prohibition was an infringement on the rights of an oppressed people. The clergy, he argued, were their natural mouthpiece in making known their grievances. With his characteristic decision, he proceeded to Rome to appeal to the Pope.

The toil of the journey and the slow progress of his suit to the Holy Father, concurred with other causes of a harassing kind to wear his strength and spirits. He returned to London in the spring of 1855 hastily to vote in a party division of the House of Commons. The keeper of the door of the House did not recognize him, so greatly was he altered. He was, in fact, a dying man, broken down by an excess of toil, physical and intellectual. He closed his earthly career Oct. 22, 1855, in the 44th year of his age and in the 17th of his conversion to Catholicism.

With manly wisdom and in the kindliest spirit, Mr. Riethmüller thus apologizes for the task he had set himself:

"It may be asked: 'Why write his life at all? Was it not, in the main, a failure? An attempt to effect impossibilities, and therefore a mere waste of energy and talent?'—I answer, that, in my opinion, when he sought to put back the hand on the dial of time, and to restore, in the midst of our own age, the faith, the maxims, and the views of the twelfth century, it was to attempt an impossibility as great, as for the fabled Danaïdes to fill their sieves with water. And I think also, that, considered as a whole, his Irish policy was a mistake and a failure. But I am yet to learn, that the only things worth recording are the brilliant annals of success. In this world of ours, there may be mistakes and failures which are worth many triumphs, because of the virtues they call forth, and the motives from which they spring. The noble errors of an unselfish enthusiasm have never permanently injured or corrupted mankind. There is much more danger in setting an undue value on prosperity and worldly wisdom, and in the pernicious habit of judging of the merit of actions by the result alone.

"Taken at the lowest, the life of Frederick Lucas is a remarkable chapter in the religious history of our time, and, as such, not without interest for the general reader. It is the story of the recoil of a very powerful mind, from the scepticism and presumption of an age 'blasted with excess of light,' and of its finding repose amid the shadows, that seemed to have passed away for ever. But, when we come to estimate the full character of the man, it has a different and far higher value; for it tells of a lofty heroism, which belonged indeed to the knightly virtues of the Middle Ages, but which must be reproduced in some form in every century that is not wholly debased and rotten. No Paladin ever bore his banner more stainlessly through toil and peril, no Confessor ever trod more fearlessly on the red-hot ploughshares, and no Martyr ever went to his rest with a stronger and a calmer faith. In his high sense of honour and duty, in his dauntless courage, in his entire unselfishness, and complete submission to the will of God, he has left an example for all to follow; and I think of him now as in his proper

place, amongst the spirits of just men made perfect, whose errors in action or opinion here below have all been blotted out by that Divine Mercy, which, knowing the secrets of our hearts, and judging by other than human standards, accepts the pure intention, and the faithful endeavour, and supplies whatever is wanting in the weakness and ignorance of our nature."—Pp. 126—128.

In parting with this interesting little volume, we have only to add, that if we had felt a lower interest than we do in its subject, we should have welcomed it as the work of one who has proved himself to possess the not very common qualities, at least in their combination, of unfailing candour, an affectionate disposition, a dispassionately philosophical spirit, and a clear and powerful style. We hope to meet Mr. Riethmüller again in the pleasant walks of literature.

NOTES ON THE OLD TESTAMENT.

"JEHOVAH hath said it." These words are a form of promise, or oath, with which the speeches of the Almighty often end in the book of Jeremiah and in some of the other prophets. In the book of Leviticus, the speeches end with the equally emphatic words, "I am Jehovah." The meaning of these first-mentioned words is very badly expressed by the "saith Jehovah" of the Authorized Version, which are the quiet words of the historian rather than the forcible assertion of the speaker. As an instance of the way in which they are used, take the last verse of Jeremiah, chap. i.

> "And they shall fight against thee, but shall not prevail over thee.
> For I am with thee to deliver thee. Jehovah hath said it."

Egypt nicknamed Rahab or the Boaster. At the time of the invasion of Judea by the Assyrians, when the Jews fancied they had reason to expect help from Tirhakah, king of Egypt, Isaiah warned them they would be disappointed, and says in chap. xxx. 7,

> "For Egypt shall help in vain and to no purpose;
> Therefore have I named it the Boaster, that sitteth still."

This nickname for Egypt is made use of by other Hebrew writers, who afterwards borrowed it from Isaiah. Thus the writer of the latter chapters of Isaiah, which were written at the time of the return from captivity, addresses the Almighty in chap. li. 9:

> "Art not thou the same that did cut down the Boaster [or Egypt],
> That woundedst the crocodile?"

The same correction is to be made in Psalm lxxxvii.:

"I might mention the Boaster [or Egypt] and Babel unto those that understand.
Lo, Philistia and Tyre with Ethiopia."

And also in Psalm lxxxix.:

"Thou breakest the Boaster [or Egypt] like one who is slain;
By thy strong arm thou scatteredst thy enemies."

Jeremiah xlvi. 11:

"Go up into Gilead, and get balsam,
O virgin daughter of Egypt.
In vain shalt thou multiply [thine own] medicines;
They are no healing for thee."

In this way the prophet taunts Egypt with its political and social disorders, and reminds us of its celebrity in raising medicinal herbs, as described by Homer in Odyssey, lib. iv. 229.

Jeremiah xlvi. 16:

"And they said, Arise, and let us go back to our own people, and to the land of our birth, from the sword of the Greeks."

So is this passage translated by the LXX., who would teach us to make the same correction in chap. l. 16. The Ionians, or Greeks of Asia Minor, had been employed as mercenaries in the Egyptian armies for at least two generations before the time of Jeremiah. They are particularly mentioned by Herodotus. Their overbearing conduct to the country that employed them is described in verse 21:

"Her hirelings also in the midst of her are like fatted bullocks."

Ezekiel xxxii. 14:

"Then will I keep their waters low."

The prophet thus threatens the Egyptians with a scanty overflow, and consequently a bad harvest. The Authorized Version has, "make their waters deep."

---

1 Kings x. 22:

"Once in three years the fleet of Tarshish came, bringing gold and silver, ivory and apes, and parrots."

The Authorized Version has "peacocks." But peacocks are northern birds, and are not to be found on a voyage down the Red Sea, and parrots are there common. The Hebrew word is *tac*, which is the root of the Greek and Latin word *psit-tac-us*.

---

1 Kings vii. 6—8.

When Solomon had built his own house or palace and the house of the forest of Lebanon, which latter may perhaps have

been a wing or part of the former, he then "made the porch of columns fifty cubits in length and thirty cubits in breadth. And the porch was fronting them, and the columns and the roof were fronting them."

Thus the porch was no part of either palace, but an ornamental portico standing by itself and facing the palaces. These buildings were common in the Greek cities. Pausanius describes more than one such at Athens. But our translators seem to have been misled by thinking that the porch of columns was the doorway into one of the two fore-mentioned palaces.

"And he made the porch of the throne, even the porch of judgment wherein he might judge, and he covered it with cedar from floor to roof. And his own house in which he dwelled had a court in the rear, from the house to the porch."

Thus this porch of the throne or judgment-seat was behind the palace, and separated from it by a court. This court we may suppose to have been paved, and to have been the place called the Pavement, to which Jesus was led, in John xix. 13; while the bema or judgment-seat upon which Pilate sat was under this porch of the throne. Jesus and the assembled Jews stood upon the pavement or court between the porch of the throne and the palace. S. S.

UGONOTTORUM STRAGES: THE MASSACRE OF THE HUGUENOTS.

The 24th of August is a day fruitful in associations to the mind of every Englishman,—above all, to every Nonconformist; and, as was natural and proper, the Dissenting pulpit and the Dissenting press have sent forth powerful utterances on the subject of the "Black Bartholomew" of 1662. But there was another feast of St. Bartholomew celebrated in another land ninety years before, full of tremendous interest and productive of great results, fruitful also in weighty lessons,—the memory of which it may be useful to keep alive, not for the purpose of inflaming sectarian bigotry, but of guarding against the impulses of blind zeal in ourselves, and of repressing every tendency towards a persecuting spirit. We would desire to give a condensed and, as far as we can make it so, an impartial outline of the Massacre of the Huguenots in 1572.

To ascertain the origin of the massacre,—if this were a suitable occasion to enter on so extensive an inquiry,—it would be necessary to trace minutely the records of many previous years; but this our limits will not allow. Suffice it, then, to state that in the middle of the 16th century the doctrines of the Reformers

had found adherents in France; and these, in many cases, were men of high culture and distinguished rank,—not merely tradesmen and farmers, merchants and members of the learned professions, but high nobles and princes of the blood. But the sovereigns who successively swayed the sceptre of France,—Francis I., Henry II., Francis II. and Charles IX.,—were bigoted adherents to the Catholic faith and devoted to the see of Rome. The first two of these kings had issued rigorous edicts against the new religion, and these were enforced with unrelenting severity. The chiefs of the Huguenot party often remonstrated against these edicts; sometimes they resisted them. On one or two occasions, they endeavoured to seize by force the persons whom they regarded as the instigators of the cruelties to which their partizans were subjected. At last, in 1562, they broke out into open war; and after more than a year of bloodshed, they extorted from the court a pacification—the "Peace of Orleans" as it was called—by which the free exercise of their religion was guaranteed. The nominal king at this time was Charles IX., but he was a mere boy, and the government was really in the hands of his mother, Catharine dei Medici,—a woman of unbounded cunning, duplicity and perfidy; capable of making a jest of all religious observances, yet in her heart a slave to superstition; devoted to the interests of Rome, and therefore disposed in general to entrust the affairs of the kingdom to the princes of the house of Guise, whose hatred of the Protestants was notorious. She sometimes favoured, or appeared to favour, the Protestant chiefs; but it was only because she feared that the credit of the Guises, the princes of Lorraine, was likely to eclipse her own.

The Peace of Orleans was made in 1563. Two years afterwards, a conference was held at Bayonne between Catharine dei Medici, the young king her son, and the Duke of Guise, on the one part, and her daughter, the Queen of Spain, wife of Philip II., attended by the Duke of Alva and the Count of Benevento, on the other; at which, as all historians are agreed, measures were resolved upon for violating the pacification in every point. The terms of this understanding or *treaty*—for it was really a treaty between the two monarchs of France and Spain—were never reduced to writing. Nevertheless it is beyond a doubt that the parties entered into a solemn compact to the effect that each of them should exert himself to put down heresy and extirpate its supporters in his own dominions, and that the two kings should lend each other mutual aid in case of any difficulty arising from their efforts to carry this resolution into effect. Some Catholic writers affirm that the massacre of St. Bartholomew's-day was planned at the interview at Bayonne. This cannot be true with reference to the *details* of that sad event. Many of its details could not, at the distance of seven years, have been foreseen. Still there cannot be a reasonable doubt that the carnage

of that dreadful day was but *the execution of a general plan* which had been then and there deliberately adopted.*

The French court was not then as wise as it afterwards became. It adopted measures which had the effect of irritating rather than subduing the Huguenot leaders, and put them on their guard without depriving them of the power of self-defence. The edict which established their worship was so interpreted that it scarcely left them any religious freedom at all. They were assaulted and insulted without redress in places where they were weak, and oppressed under form of law where such outrages could not be attempted with safety. The towns which had favoured their cause were disarmed and dismantled. They were not restored to their estates and dignities, in accordance with the treaty. And they could obtain no justice either in the courts of law or from the royal council, to which they forwarded their complaints. Lastly, armed bands were permitted to break into their places of worship and to massacre the congregations indiscriminately. The massacre of Vassy was the last of these outrages. It was perpetrated by the servants and armed retainers of the Duke of Guise, in his presence and under his very eyes. They rushed into a barn where a Protestant congregation were engaged in worship, shot the minister, fired upon the assembled people, killed sixty of them and wounded not less than two hundred. Not one of the sufferers was armed; many were women and children. There was no pretence that any provocation had been given, nor was any resistance offered. But there was no redress. This outrage, perpetrated by one of the chief ministers of the kingdom, or at least by his servants in his presence, and never avenged, drove the Huguenots into insurrection once more, and was the signal for the *second* civil war.

It was concluded by the "Peace of Chartres" (1568), in which everything was promised that the friends of Protestantism demanded. But its conditions were, like those of the former treaty, broken almost before the ink of the royal signature was dry. "The Huguenots were neither permitted to enjoy peace nor freedom of conscience; they were in greater danger than during the war. In three months' time, more than two thousand of them were slain, at various places, either by their private enemies or by popular commotions. René, Seigneur de Cipierre, son of Claude de Savoie, Compte de Teude, was massacred at Fréjus, with thirty persons of his retinue, by Gaspar de Villeneuve, Marquis of Ars, as he was returning from Nice, whither he had gone to see the Duke of Savoy, his kinsman. The mob slaughtered more than a hundred persons at Amiens, a hundred

* Adriani, *Storia*, &c., lib. xx. pp. 44—49; Davila, *Storia*, &c., Vol. I. pp. 342—345; Mézeray, *Abrégé Chronologique*, Vol. VIII. p. 511. But, above all, see Strada, *De Bello Belgico*, p. 109 (who had before him the correspondence of Philip II. with his sister of this date).

and fifty at Auxerre, several at Blois, at Bourges, at Issoudun, at Troyes, and at twenty other places. But nothing seemed more cruel than what the populace did at Ligny, in Barrois, where a Protestant who had refused to hang up festoons before his door on the day of the Fête Dieu, and had committed some act of disrespect, was dragged from his house, in presence of the magistrate, *and burnt in the public square!*"* An attempt was made at the same period by some of the royal troops to seize the Prince de Condé and Admiral Coligny, the chiefs of the Huguenots, by treachery. They escaped the snare with difficulty, and immediately summoned their adherents to arms. Thus commenced the *third* religious war.

The Huguenots were not successful in the field. They were defeated at Jarnac, where the Prince de Condé was wounded, made prisoner and slain in cold blood. They were defeated again at Montcontour. Many of their towns and fortresses were taken, and not a few of their princely châteaux levelled to the ground. Often were their troops, dispirited and broken, on the point of dispersing. But the brave Admiral de Coligny was unconquered still. Nothing could exceed his determination and energy. He rallied his broken legions, inspired them with confidence in him, in their cause and in themselves; recruited their ranks by fresh levies, and conducted them, by a march which to this day excites the wonder and astonishment of military historians, from the battle-fields of Gascony and Languedoc to the walls of Paris. He was about to lay siege to that city, with every prospect of success, when the queen-mother determined once more to make peace. It was concluded at St. Germain's on the 11th day of August, 1570, and contained the usual stipulations and guarantees. But the Huguenots reposed little confidence in the good faith of the queen-mother and the court. As soon as the peace was ratified, the Queen of Navarre, with the Prince of Bearn, her young son, the youthful Prince de Condé, son of him who had been slain at Jarnac, the Admiral Coligny, with La Noue, Montgomeri, La Rochefoucault and other lords of their party, withdrew immediately to Rochelle, without so much as paying their respects to the king or his mother.

But Catharine dei Medici had learned from past experience; and she and her son and their confidants determined to exert their utmost art to overcome the suspicions of those with whom they had made peace with no other purpose than that of destroying them the more effectually. Whatever may be thought of the stipulations made at Bayonne five years previously, there is a consent, almost unanimous, among historians that the pacification of St. Germain's was entered into by the court of France with the deliberate purpose of closing it by a massacre of the

* Mézeray, IX. 8, 9.

Protestant chiefs.* For this purpose it was necessary to throw them off their guard. Orders were therefore issued, and were everywhere enforced, that no violation of the treaty should be permitted; that, on the contrary, it should be observed with the most scrupulous exactness; and even that its stipulations should receive a wide interpretation in matters favourable to the Huguenots.† Their wishes were attended to in matters to which the treaty of peace gave them no claim. Whenever their nobles and chiefs appeared at court, as some of them did occasionally, to represent the wishes of their party, they were received with distinguished consideration and treated with the utmost kindness and apparent confidence. In this manner the suspicions of many were allayed or removed. They began to believe that the king, his brothers and his ministers, were as weary as they were themselves of the tumults and bloodshed of the last eight or ten years. A special trap was baited for the Admiral, who, not less wary than he was daring, still felt distrust. Charles professed to him an intention to declare war against Philip II. of Spain, the great antagonist of Protestantism, and offered him the command of an army with which he was to invade the Low Countries, already in insurrection against the government of the Duke of Alva. Coligny was invited to court for the purpose of arranging the details of this enterprize, and was so overcome by the dissimulation of the king, that he no longer felt a doubt of his loyalty and good faith.

And now the plot was nearly ripe: all that remained was to bring the victims together in some place where they should be completely in the power of the court, and deprived of the means alike of resistance and escape. With this view, Catharine and Charles proposed a marriage between the young Prince of Bearn, who soon afterwards became King of Navarre, and ultimately King of France as Henry IV., and the Princess Marguérite, sister to King Charles. As that monarch expressed it, "his fat Marguérite was the trap with which he had caught all his Huguenot rebels."‡ Pope Pius V., not being privy to the designs of the French court, was alarmed at the prospect of the advantage which it would confer on the heretical faction, and the damage it might do to the Catholic interest. He sent a legate to dissuade King Charles IX. from concluding an alliance so objectionable. The king answered the arguments of his Holiness as well as they could be answered without betraying the secret; but conjured the legate to assure the Pope of his filial obedience, and, squeezing his hand, added these pregnant words—"*Oh! if I could but explain myself more fully!*"§ The same reasons

* Capilupi, *Lo Stratagemma*, &c., printed at Rome in Sept., 1572; Davila, *Storia*, &c., II. 249; P. Daniel, *Histoire*, X. 474; Mézeray, IX. 52, &c. &c.

† Davila, *Storia*, &c., II. 252, 253; Thuanus, III. 67.

‡ Petitot, p. xlv. § Mézeray, IX. 67.

which made this marriage hateful to the Pope rendered it highly acceptable to the Huguenot chiefs. It was accordingly agreed upon, and fixed to take place at Paris in the summer of the year 1572. The parties being within the prohibited degrees, a dispensation was applied for. "Pius V. refused it as long as he lived; but his successor, Gregory XIII., less scrupulous *or better informed*, granted it without difficulty."* It was about this time, according to Sully, that Charles said to Catharine, "*Well, am I not acting my part beautifully?*" to which she replied, "*Very well, my son; but you must keep it up to the end of the play.*"† He played it so well that the Queen of Navarre, with her son and the young Prince de Condé, the Admiral, with Teligny, his son-in-law, La Rochefoucault, De Resnil, De Piles, De Grammont, Pordaillan, De Rosny, Bouchavannes, and a great many other Protestant nobles and gentlemen, made no difficulty in accepting the royal invitation to grace with their presence the nuptials which they hoped would confirm to France the blessings of tranquillity, and secure to themselves and their posterity the full enjoyment of that religious liberty which the peace of 1570 had guaranteed. They came, attended, as was their wont, by their retainers and officers, of whom many were young persons of family, some of them scions of the noblest houses in France. The occasion being one of rejoicing and festivity, several of the Huguenot lords brought with them their wives, their children and their households. Thus were the heads of the party which was to be crushed assembled in Paris, a walled town, the populace of which was animated by fanatical bigotry against them,—within whose walls was an armed force eager to execute any orders which it might receive for slaughtering them, with or without a pretext,—and the gates of which were in the possession of a party on whose honour or truth experience had shewn that no reliance was to be placed.

The marriage took place on the 18th of August, having been postponed for a few days on account of the death of the aged Queen of Navarre, the mother of the bridegroom. Almost all the Protestant historians, and several Catholics also, decide without hesitation that she was carried off by poison, administered by order of the queen-mother in a pair of perfumed gloves. We rest no weight on this imputation. The death of a lady in very advanced life, who had been suffering for some days under acute fever, and whose history had been one scene of anxieties and distresses, need not force us to have recourse to the theory of poison. Whether a fatal poison could have been introduced into the constitution in the manner suggested, may admit of doubt. On the whole, we look on the suspicion as one which originated rather in the character of the person suspected than

* Mézeray, IX. 68. † Sully, I. 17.

in the facts of the case. The suspicion, however, existed, and inspired some of the Huguenot chiefs with doubts as to the intentions of the king. There were other facts which seemed to intimate that they were not safe in Paris. Montluc, Bishop of Valence, a man of probity and talent, lately appointed ambassador of France to the republic of Poland, had, in taking his audience of leave, gathered from some words which fell from Charles that mischief was brewing against the Protestants. He imparted his suspicion to his friend the Count de la Rochefoucault, strongly advising him to quit the capital immediately. The Count, attaching little importance to the advice, remained, and lost his life. Letters were intercepted from the Cardinal de Pellevé, Archbishop of Rheims, addressed to the Cardinal of Lorraine, who was then at Rome, in which plain allusion was made to the existence and the nature of the bloody plot. These letters were laid before Admiral Coligny; but he had been completely won over by the apparent sincerity of Charles IX., and reposed a full reliance on the word of his sovereign. In vain did many of his friends entreat him to take his departure, and to allow them all to retire to their estates or to a place of safety. In vain did the men of Rochelle send to him letter after letter, warning him of the danger of trusting everything to the honour of a king who was known to be violent even to fury, and of an Italian woman who had meditated the destruction of all that was great in the kingdom. He replied that "he would rather be dragged through the muddy streets of Paris than give occasion to a fourth civil war."* Unable to persuade him, his advisers took measures for their own safety. They left the city of Paris and took up their quarters in the suburbs. They said, when questioned on the subject, that "the air of the faubourgs agreed with their health better than that of the town, and that they preferred the country breezes to both."† The Maréchal de Montmorency was still more cautious. Charles IX. sent for him repeatedly to come to town, as he wanted to confer with him upon important business, but he pleaded the effects of seasickness after his recent voyage to England, and would not stir from his château at Chantilly.‡ The Baron de Langoiran, M. de Rohan, the Vidame de Chartres, Du Breuil, De Ségur, Du Toucher, Des Hayes, and the Marquis de Rosny, father of the Duc de Sully, were among those who took up their residence in the faubourgs. The reply of Langoiran to Coligny, when he asked him how he could think of leaving Paris with a set of fools, is well known. "Because," he said, "I think it better to live with the fools than die with the wise men." The news of this emigration convinced the queen-mother and her fellow-conspirators, the king, his brother, the Duke of Anjou, the

* Mézeray, IX. 71. † Sully, I. 26. ‡ Ibid, I. 27.

Duke of Guise,* the Count de Retz, the Keeper of the Seals (De Biragues), the Duke of Nevers, and beyond a doubt (though his biographer denies it) Marshal Tavannes, that the mine must be sprung instantly if the explosion was to be effectual. There must, however, have been considerable difference of opinion amongst themselves respecting the immediate measures to be adopted, for their discussions were long and frequent. They excused their nightly vigils (their deliberations were held chiefly at night) by their occupations in connection with the nuptial festivities; they said it was necessary to make each night arrangements for the festivities of the morrow.

At length the first blow was struck, but whether by common consent of the whole conclave is doubtful. Most probably it was the private contrivance of Catharine, Count Tavannes and the Guises, unknown to the rest or without their consent. But whoever was the author of the deed, it was well chosen for a commencement. It was a stroke calculated to secure four distinct objects, all of which were desirable with a view to the success of the undertaking; *first*, it was calculated to deprive the Protestants of any head or central authority around which they might rally for counsel or defence; *secondly*, to give public notice to the fanatical Catholics that they were to hold themselves in readiness for some important stroke; *thirdly*, to afford to the royal faction a plausible excuse for closing the city gates, so as to confine the victims, as it were, in a cage; and, *fourthly*, to provoke the Huguenots to some act of tumult, or even of disrespect, were it only an over-earnest demand for justice, which might serve as an excuse for treating them as insurgents and for giving them over to military execution. For all these purposes no means could appear more suitable than the assassination of Admiral Coligny in the public streets and in broad daylight. Tavannes afterwards boasted that it was he who had suggested this "great stroke,"† but it may have occurred to others as well as to him. Perhaps the queen-mother may have had, as Mézeray thinks she had, a farther object. She may have hoped that the Montmorencys, inflamed with rage at the murder of their kinsman, would rush to arms at once and endeavour to wreak their revenge on the house of Guise, whose bitter enmity against the Admiral would cause them to be suspected of the crime; that the princes of that family would stand on their defence; that war being thus waged in the streets of Paris, the king would have a pretext for interfering to put down both factions; and thus all the objects of her hatred, for she cordially hated the leaders of both parties, would be destroyed at once.‡

* Son of the Duke whose retinue had committed the massacre at Vassy. His father had been assassinated, and he always blamed Coligny as the instigator of the crime.

† Mézeray, IX. 72.

‡ Ibid. IX. 74.

The historian does not state his authority for this supposition; but it shadows forth a design not unlikely to have occurred to the mind of a princess brought up at the feet of Macchiavelli.

Be this as it may, the assassination of Coligny was resolved upon. On Friday, the 22nd of August, four days after the wedding, as the Admiral was returning from the Louvre, where he had just had an interview with the king on affairs of state, while he was walking slowly and reading a paper, he was fired upon from a window on the ground floor of a house on the opposite side of the street. Two balls took effect; one broke a finger of his right hand, the other shattered his left arm and brought him to the ground. Wounded as he was, the veteran had presence of mind to point out to his attendants the window whence the shot had come. They broke open the door of the house, which belonged to a retainer of the Duke of Guise, and rushed in to seize the assassin, but he had escaped by a back entrance, and fled on a horse which was furnished by one of that nobleman's servants.*

The Admiral was not killed, nor was the wound which he had received mortal. Thus far the intention of his enemies had failed. But in several respects the failure answered the purpose for which the blow had been designed. In one respect it even served the purpose better than it would have been served by the Admiral's death. He was carried to his hotel, where his friends gathered around him; they were thus collected for the slaughter to which they were destined. But they did not rush to arms as had been expected. It is probable, indeed, that except the swords which all noblemen and gentlemen then wore, rather as a mark of their rank than for warlike purposes, very few of them had brought any arms with them from their castles. The Admiral himself counselled them to preserve order. He looked upon the attack on his person as the result of private malice, and reposed full confidence in the justice of the king.

The king was playing at tennis with the Duke of Guise when the news of this outrage was brought to him. He assumed the appearance of the greatest indignation, and declared his intention to find out and punish the authors and perpetrators of the crime. He gave orders that, to prevent the murderer from escaping, all the gates of Paris should be closed except two, which were kept open for the entry of provisions; and he commanded the Duke of Anjou to bring the whole of the body-guards, reinforced by four hundred additional men, into the city; posting a company at Coligny's door, and another within the house to protect him and his friends from farther violence. He even went to visit Coligny, accompanied by the queen-mother, the Dukes of Anjou and

* Davila, II. 289. Sully says the horse belonged to the king's stables. Both may be true. The assassin was Monrevel, who had already murdered De Mouy.

Guise, the Count de Retz and some others. He remained with him nearly an hour, expressing the utmost grief for the injury he had received, and declared his firm determination to punish those who had so foully attempted his life. Perhaps, indeed, he rather overdid the show of emotion; for it appears that Coligny, either then or soon after, expressed something that looked like apprehension of foul play. To quiet him, Charles gave directions that the chiefs of the Huguenots should leave the lodgings which they occupied in different parts of the town and take up their residence in the Admiral's hotel and the adjoining houses, for his protection and their common safety. Every occasion was made a pretext for drawing the net round them more closely. Under pretext of some fear lest the princes of the house of Lorraine should excite the populace to violence, the young King of Navarre and his cousin the Prince de Condé were invited to remove, with their personal friends, to the Louvre, where it was pretended they would be safe from outrage. In the course of a few hours, all these friends and retainers were barbarously murdered in the very presence of the sovereign whose hospitality they had been invited to partake.

On the night of the 22nd of August and the day of the 23rd, there were consultations held among the leaders of both sides. Many of the Protestants, alarmed by the threatening looks and words of the armed men and burghers with whom the streets were filled, counselled immediate flight. The Vidame de Chartres strongly recommended this course. Téligny as warmly opposed it. The physicians sent by the king assured the Admiral and his friends that it would be impossible for him to travel in his present condition, without risk of inflaming his wounds and bringing on fever. The Admiral decided on remaining where he was. But the Vidame returned to the charge; he insisted that Coligny was better, and might very well endure the easy motion of a litter. Information of his perseverance in urging this course was carried to the Louvre by a Protestant nobleman, Bouchavannes,* who probably mentioned it inadvertently or for some praiseworthy purpose. But his indiscretion had all the effect of treason. The secret council dreaded lest the urgency of the Vidame should at last prevail, and their prey thereby escape out of their hands. Orders were instantly given for the butchery which had been so long in preparation. The execution of them was entrusted to Guise, of whose energy in such a cause no doubt could be entertained. Guise was in other respects well qualified for the charge assigned him; he was a great favourite with the common people, who looked upon him as one of the champions of their faith, and would rally round him for its support; and he had a great num-

* Thuanus (III. 64) says it was he; other historians do not name the informant, though they relate the fact.

ber of armed men in his employment, whose services would be useful. He was entrusted for the occasion with the command of the military force then in Paris. At ten o'clock at night, he sent for the officers of these troops, and ordered them to have their men ready under arms. He gave instructions to Charron, the "Prevôt des Marchands," and Marcel, who had previously filled that office, to arm the burghers; to collect them first in private houses and afterwards to draw them up in the public squares; to take care that they should have torches in readiness to light up the windows; and that their men should wear, as a badge of distinction, a white band or scarf on the left arm and a cross of the same colour in their hats. When all was ready, they were to commence the massacre at a signal which would be given by the tolling of the great bell of Paris. The Duc de Montpensier, the Duc de Nevers, and many others of the nobility of the court, armed themselves and their retainers, and held themselves in readiness to issue forth and to take part in the work of destruction on hearing the signal. It is said that Queen Catharine, apprehensive lest her son at the last moment should relinquish his bloody purpose, caused the tocsin to be rung an hour sooner than the appointed time.* Be that as it may, the signal when given was promptly obeyed.

The Dukes of Guise, D'Aumale and Angoulême, with other captains and a large body of men, repaired immediately to the hotel where lay the wounded Coligny. They were at once admitted by the guards whom the Duke of Anjou had posted there for that purpose. The Dukes and the officers remained in the court-yard of the hotel; they sent a number of their men up to the chambers where the inmates slept. The Admiral, hearing the noise, asked his servant who was by him what it meant. "My lord," he answered, "God calls us to Himself!" and, rushing out of the room by a second entrance, succeeded in making his escape. The murderers, when they came in, found Coligny on his knees. One of them, named Bême, a servant of the Duke of Guise, rushed at him with drawn sword. "Young man," said the Admiral, "you ought to respect these grey hairs; but do what you will; you can shorten my life but little." Bême ran him through the body, others stabbed him with their poniards, and tossed his corpse out of the window. It was treated with all possible indignity. It was mutilated, thrown upon a dunghill, and some days afterwards dragged to the gallows at Montfaucon, hung up by the only leg which remained attached to the body, and half roasted by fire.† The king, accompanied by his mother and his court, went out to feast his eyes on this spectacle. One of the courtiers, offended by the odour of the corpse, turned his head away. "*Know*," said Charles, "*that nothing smells so sweet*

---

* Mézeray, IX. 80.

† Ibid., IX. 85, 86.

as a dead enemy."* In the same house and at the same time with the Admiral were slain his son-in-law Téligny, the Sieurs De Montaumar and Rourai, with others of his friends and retinue. Among the rest, Guerchy, who fell sword in hand, the only Protestant who did so. Aroused by the tumult, he leaped out of bed, seized his sword, and, having wrapped a cloak round his arm, stood upon his defence till he was overpowered and slain.† During the massacre, seven hundred houses were treated in the same way as the hotel of Admiral Coligny. Of the seven hundred, only one offered resistance.‡

The events of that dismal Sunday offer a sad monotony of guilt and suffering. Houses broken into, inmates murdered, violence done to the feelings of nature and of common decency, every conceivable insult offered to the memory of the slain. There was one kind of outrage, and perhaps but one, of which the assassins were innocent,—outrage upon the feelings of survivors. If there were survivors, it was by accident only. Their aim and their hope was to exterminate all. Such were the orders given them by authority. Marshal Tavannes, with the Dukes of Nevers and Montpensier, paraded the streets on horseback, commanding the people, in the king's name, to slaughter every Huguenot, man, woman and child. "Kill, kill!" they cried; "bloodletting is as wholesome in August as in May!" There was no want of zeal in fulfilling the royal wishes. The streets were everywhere strewn with mangled bodies, and the gutters ran red with human blood. Some of the incidents of that dreadful scene possess a dramatic interest. The Count de la Rochefoucault, the same who had slighted the warning of Bishop Montluc, had been engaged with the king at play till a late hour on the previous night; early in the morning he felt himself seized in his bed by masked men; he thought it was King Charles and his companions who were come to whip him by way of practical joke; he was stabbed to death with many wounds. Caumont la Force was likewise slain in his bed, as he lay sleeping between his two sons. One of them was killed beside his father; the other, a child of nine or ten years old, was wounded, but escaped by counterfeiting death, and afterwards creeping under the dead bodies of his father and his brother. The Marquis de Resnel had a suit pending with a kinsman, Bussy d'Amboise, on account of an estate of his which the latter claimed; d'Amboise decided it in his own favour by seeking out and murdering his opponent. Towards the evening, the ladies of the court went out in a body, picking their steps through the bloody streets, to see the corpses of the slain. That of the Baron du Pont was the object of an

---

* Papire, Masson and Castelman vouch for this anecdote. The expression is not original.

† Davila, II. 298; Mézeray, IX. 83.

‡ Mézeray, IX. 83.

indecent curiosity, on account of a suit in which he was engaged with his wife, a lady of the house of Soubise. They laughed and tittered while making their inspection. Bigotry had overcome modesty as well as humanity, and converted women into fiends.

The Duke de Sully gives a graphic account of his own adventures that morning. He had accompanied the King of Navarre to Paris in the capacity of page; but being only thirteen years old, he was permitted to dwell in separate lodgings, with his tutor and a valet-de-chambre, while he pursued his studies in the Collège de Bourgogne. He had gone to bed early on Saturday night; at three o'clock on Sunday morning he was awakened by the ringing of all the bells in Paris, and the shouts of the rabble in the streets. M. St. Julien, his tutor, and the valet, rushed out to see the cause of the tumult; he never saw or heard of them again, and doubtless they fell among the first victims of the massacre. After a short time, while he was dressing himself, his host, who was a Protestant, entered his room pale and in consternation, and told the boy what was going on. He said that he had gone to mass to save his life and prevent his house from being plundered, and he advised Sully to do the same. Young as he was, he thought it better to seek refuge at his college; he put on his student's gown, and taking under his arm a large volume of Roman Catholic devotion, "*The Hours*," he sallied forth. He was horror-struck at the spectacle which the street presented. Furious fanatics were rushing to and fro, forcing open the houses, and crying, "Kill, kill! massacre the Huguenots!" The blood which he saw spilled before his eyes redoubled his terror. He fell into the midst of a Corps de Garde, and was seized; the book which he carried served him as a passport, and he was let go. Twice again he fell into the same danger, and escaped by the same means. At length he arrived at the college, but the porter refused to let him in; he remained for a considerable time in the street at the mercy of the fanatics who were on the search for victims, when happily it occurred to him to ask for the Principal of the college, a worthy man, named La Haye, who was very fond of him. The porter, for a bribe, consented to bring the Principal; he admitted Sully instantly, and took him to his own room. There he found two priests, who were talking of the Sicilian Vespers; they tried to tear the boy by force out of the hands of La Haye. "The orders," they exclaimed, "are to kill even the infants at the breast." But the worthy Principal would not give him up to their cruelty; he removed him from the chamber, and stowed him away in a private closet, where he kept him for three days under lock and key, supplying him meanwhile with food. At the end of that time, a stop having been put to the promiscuous slaughter, he was brought out from his hiding-place. After eight days he

received a letter from his father, who had heard of his safety, advising him to remain still in Paris, since even the Prince whom he served was not free to leave it; and counselling him to avoid an otherwise inevitable destruction, by doing as the Prince himself had done,—that is, by going to mass.*

Other children were not so fortunate. We read of a little one that was seized by a ruffian, who rushed towards the river, carrying it in his arms. The child thought he was in sport; laughed in his face, and began to play with his beard. This might have turned a tiger from its prey; but the ruffian only drew his dagger, stabbed it, and tossed it into the Seine. Many a similar burden did that river float upon its waves on the day of the "bloody St. Bartholomew."

Seven or eight hundred of the Huguenots, believing that the danger which threatened them was a mere outburst of popular fanaticism, took refuge in the prisons. They fled for shelter under the wings of justice. This only lightened the labour of their persecutors. They were kept in confinement till the latter were at leisure from street butchery; they were then brought forth, their brains were knocked out with bludgeons, and their bodies hurled into the Seine.†

It may be asked, how was the king employed while his ministers and courtiers, his troops and generals, assisted by an organized mob under the official chiefs of the city, were thus engaged in slaughtering so many of the best and bravest of his subjects in the immediate neighbourhood of his palace. There are abundant means of answering this question. On Saturday, the 23rd, his Majesty dined at the usual hour, about eleven o'clock. Soon afterwards, a kind of council was held in the royal closet, at which Queen Catharine, the Duke of Anjou, Marshal Tavannes and the other confidants of the plot, were present; and at which the immediate execution of the long-projected massacre was resolved upon. The rest of the day was spent in making preparations; but with these the king, after having given his consent to the execution, appears not to have intermeddled. On that night he sat up late at play, having for the companions of his pleasures some of those who were marked out for slaughter in the morning. He went to bed and slept for two hours. At break of day he rose, and, with his mother and his brother of Anjou, repaired to a room *which looked into the court-yard of the palace* to see the commencement of the execution.‡ This is the statement of the Duke of Anjou, one of the family party thus collected,—a horrid statement, for it necessarily implies the pre-meditated butchery of those who had been invited to partake the shelter of the royal palace.

---

* Sully, *Mémoires*, &c., I. 29, 30. † Mézeray, IX. 81, 82.

‡ Letter of the Duke of Anjou, *ap.* Petitot, § xliv. 508. This letter was written (or dictated) two years after the massacre.

His Majesty, having taken his post, caused the King of Navarre and the Prince de Condé to be summoned to his presence. They came with fear and trembling, for none of their gentlemen or servants were allowed to come with them; they were not allowed to bring their swords; and the royal guards through whom they had to pass threatened them with their weapons and insolent gestures. As soon as they had reached the presence, M. d'O, commander of the king's guard, began to call over, one by one, the names of the Huguenot chiefs who were in the Louvre, and each, as soon as he arrived in the court-yard, was cut down by the soldiers, who were drawn up in two lines with their weapons ready. In this manner were slain the Compte de la Rochefoucault, the Marquis de Resnel, Piles, the brave defender of St. Jean de Luz in the war which ended two years previously, "the brave Pardaillan," as he is styled by contemporary historians, Francourt, Chancellor to the King of Navarre, Lavardin and others to the number of two hundred.* Their naked corpses were afterwards exposed at the gate of the palace.† Charles then turned to the two princes, horror-stricken as they were at the murders of their best friends of which they had been made witnesses, and commanded them in tones of fury and with horrid execrations, his customary style, to abjure Protestantism on the spot. It appears to us that the King of Navarre made little difficulty in doing what was required, though Sully says that *both* the princes manifested their reluctance; the Prince de Condé certainly did, insomuch that the king threatened him with death or imprisonment. "Death," he exclaimed, "the mass or the bastille."‡ The young prince yielded, and declared himself a Catholic. To prevent mistake or relapse, both the princes were compelled to write letters to the Pope, announcing their conversion. In the course of the morning, having discovered a number of the Huguenots flying for their lives, Charles seized a gun and fired upon them with his own hand.§ After some time spent in these engagements and others of a similar kind, his Majesty despatched orders to various governors of towns and provinces to imitate the example of the capital; the orders were in some cases written; in others, to prevent future inconvenience, they were verbal. But that very day letters were sent to the governors of provinces, charging them to assure the people in their districts that the king did not intend and was not going to break the edict of pacification. In one of these he had written that he had "allied himself with the King of Navarre and the Prince de Condé to avenge the death of his cousin the Admiral." But the Guises, apprehensive as they might well be, that the queen-

* Davila, II. 298, 299. † Mézeray, IX. 84.

‡ Mézeray, IX. 92; Davila, IX. 311.

§ Voltaire learned this fact from Marshal Tessé, who had heard it from the lips of the man who loaded the gun for his Majesty.

mother would afterwards impute to them this crime in order to destroy them, compelled the king to change his language and to write that "all that had taken place had been done by his order, to prevent the accomplishment of a detestable conspiracy which the Admiral had hatched to destroy him and all the royal family, even the King of Navarre and the Prince de Condé." Towards the evening, complaints having reached him that the rabble had used the licence which they had received for murdering Protestants as a cloak for indiscriminate murder and plunder, having slain and robbed many Catholics, he issued an order, which was published by sound of trumpet, that no one "except the officers of the guards and the functionaries of the city" should take arms or make prisoners, on pain of death. This proclamation was several times repeated. "Henceforth," says Mézeray, "murder and pillage were carried on with more regularity, but not with less cruelty." However, he did not discourage those who boasted of their achievements during the carnage. On Tuesday morning, a butcher waited upon him at the Louvre and told him that he had killed a hundred and fifty the preceding night; and a gold-beater bragged, displaying his arm, that he had despatched four hundred for his single share.

The same day, after having heard a solemn mass to thank God for the glorious victory gained *over heresy*, and given orders that a medal should be struck to commemorate it, Charles went to the Parliament to hold a bed of justice; and addressed to that assembly a set speech, in which he avowed that the massacre had been performed by his express order; that the Protestants were perpetual rebels and conspirators against his person and government; that although he had frequently pardoned their outrages, they had entered into a new conspiracy against his own life, that of his mother, his brothers, and also that of the King of Navarre; that their plot having in a wonderful manner been made known to him, he had adopted this way of preventing their wicked designs from taking effect. He called on the Court to proceed with the same severity against all the followers and adherents of the traitors who were slain.* The Parliament most submissively complied with the King's command. An indictment was drawn up against Admiral Coligny, and, being found guilty, he was sentenced to be gibbeted,—a sentence which was executed by means of an effigy of straw. Briquemaut and Cavagnes, who had managed to escape the massacre, were tried upon a similar indictment, condemned and executed. Charles not merely went to see them executed himself, but compelled the King of Navarre to accompany him.

The fate of Briquemaut and Cavagnes suggests that there were intended victims who escaped the carnage. Charles him-

* Davila, II. 305.

self pardoned three or four on the solicitation of his brother-in-law. Several were saved by their friends of the Catholic persuasion, who concealed them in their houses, as was the case with the Duke of Sully. Some bribed the miscreants who were about to murder them, by promises of land or money. Several saved themselves by professing to turn Catholics. After the first day of the carnage, not a few adopted the white scarf and cross, until they were able to escape from Paris. The Duke of Guise afforded a refuge in his mansion to about a hundred gentlemen whom he expected to gain over to his cause.* Biron, Grand Master of the Artillery, who hated such cruelty and treachery, posted some of his guns at the gate of the arsenal, which checked the fury of the assassins and enabled him to save several of his personal friends. Those who had taken up their quarters with the Vidame de Chartres and Montgomery in the faubourgs, hearing the disturbance and not knowing its cause, approached the city to see if they could be of any use; they were fired upon from the walls, and some of them wounded; this preserved them; they mounted instantly, and rode for their lives. They were pursued hotly, but most of them made their way to Normandy, and thence to England.

The massacre lasted for more than a week in Paris; for the first two days it raged furiously; after which it slackened a little. By that time, many of the objects of persecution were either dead or had escaped; yet even on the tenth day after that of St. Bartholomew, scores of victims were slain. How many were murdered in all can never be known with certainty. Mézeray says the slain in Paris amounted to 5000, of whom 700 were "*gentils-hommes*," men of noble blood. Davila and others raise the number to 10,000; some sink it down to 2000. But Thuanus (De Thou), a careful and cautious writer, says 2000 were killed on the day of St. Bartholomew alone. On the whole, the estimate of Mézeray is probably not far from the truth.

The orders which were sent to the provinces on the Sunday evening were in some places evaded; in others, frankly disobeyed; but in too many they were executed with a fiendish fidelity. Mézeray says (p. 90), "For two entire months this horrible tempest swept over the whole of France, more or less bloody, according to the disposition of the people and the governors. It was not so violent in Burgundy and in Britanny, because there were few Huguenots in those regions; nor in Languedoc and Gascony, because they were strong enough there to defend themselves; but it was very cruel at Meaux, at Troyes, at Orleans, at Nevers, at Lyons, at Thoulouse, at Bourdeaux and at Rouen, and destroyed nearly 25,000 men. At Thoulouse, they hung five Counsellors of the Parliament, in their red robes, on one

* Mézeray, IX. 84.

elm tree in the court of the palace. Matignon and the Viscount d'Ortez generously refused to imbrue their hands in the blood of their countrymen; the first preserved those of Alençon, the other those of Bayonne; they were the governors of these towns. The terror of the massacres brought back a large number to the Roman Church; but when the danger was over, most of them left it again. These, and those who had in time foreseen the storm, took refuge in different places. Sancerre, Rochelle, Montauban and Sevennes, afforded a shelter to a great many."*

As might be expected, historians vary in their estimate of those who perished in all France during this persecution. Papire Masson says, 12,000; De Thou and Mézeray, 30,000; Davila makes the number amount to 40,000; Sully to 70,000; and Archbishop Pèrefixe to 100,000. Sully had made a collection of documents and returns relating to this calamitous period; these papers, from his position as Prime Minister during the reign of Henry IV., would have been of great authority and value; but they have never been permitted to see the light, and it is probable they have been all destroyed. After all, the exact number is of little consequence. It is evident that wherever the influence of the queen-mother and her faction prevailed, every Huguenot on whom they could lay their hands was killed. Very many, however, escaped; and the massacre of their co-religionists only united them the more closely and confirmed them in their hatred of Catholicism.

In other parts of Europe, the butcheries of the St. Bartholomew excited an outburst of indignation and abhorrence such as no previous event had ever elicited. Nor was this feeling confined to Protestant states alone; it was largely diffused even in Catholic countries. No denunciations of the crime and its authors are more hearty and unreserved than those of Davila, De Thou, Pèrefixe, Mézeray and Father P. Sarpi. Pèrefixe, Archbishop of Paris and tutor to Louis XIV., calls it "an execrable deed, which never had, and God grant that it never may have, a parallel." These things ought to be borne in mind, and may serve to shew the folly of imputing to Catholics generally sympathy with an inhumanity which many of them detested. It is, however, true that not a few approved and applauded the ferocious conduct of Charles and his minions in attempting to extirpate heresy by one bloody blow. King Philip II. of Spain wrote a letter of congratulation to his brother the Most Christian King, and offered him the whole strength of his arms to assist in completing the great undertaking. The reigning Pope, Gregory XIII., caused public thanksgivings to be offered up in all the churches of Rome, and went himself in solemn procession to the church of St. Louis, to testify his gratitude for it in person. He sent a legate to con-

* Mézeray, IX. 90, 91.

gratulate the King of France, and to exhort him to go on as he had begun.* He caused a medal to be struck to commemorate the event, as one deserving to be held in everlasting honour. It contains on one side the Pope's effigy, with the inscription, GREGORIUS XIII. PONT. MAX. AN. I.; and on the other, an angel, bearing in one hand a cross, in the other a sword, with which he is slaughtering certain persons, of whom three are lying dead; one, apparently wounded, grasps a broken sword; one is fleeing; and one, a woman, is wringing her hands in distraction. The inscription is, UGONOTTORUM STRAGES: "*The Massacre of the Huguenots.*" The medallist was ashamed to represent the destroying angel as assailing unarmed men; he has therefore depicted the heretics as clothed in armour. His Holiness gave a commission to Vasari, the painter, to represent the carnage of the Feast of St. Bartholomew on the walls of the Vatican. There is in that palace a large room called the Sala Régia, the walls of which are divided into enormous panels, each filled with a picture representing some triumph of the holy see. No less than three of these are filled with paintings relating to the St. Bartholomew. In the first, Admiral Coligny, wounded, is borne into his house by his friends. Beneath the picture, as under all the other pictures in the room, there was formerly an inscription: "GASPARDUS COLIGNIUS, AMIRALIUS, ACCEPTO VULNERE, DOMUM REFERTUR.—GREG. XIII. PONTIF. MAX. 1572." A second picture represents the massacre itself; a medley of armed men, helmeted and mailed, are slaughtering others who are defenceless; in the background the body of the Admiral is seen, tossed out of the window. The inscription under this picture was, "CÆDES COLIGNII ET SOCIORUM EJUS." The third panel represents Charles IX. in council, surrounded by his brothers and the Princes of Lorraine, holding up his naked sword, as if giving order for more murders; beneath was the motto, "REX COLIGNII NECEM PROBAT." These pictures still pollute the walls of the Vatican; but the inscriptions, savouring too strongly of the intolerance and bigotry which distinguished Pope Gregory, have been erased some time since 1828, probably by order of the present Pope.†

It has been stated that on Tuesday, the 26th of August, two days after the massacre had begun, Charles IX. gave orders that a medal should be struck to perpetuate the memory of this achievement. Copies of it are occasionally to be met with, but they are rare, much more rare than those issued by order of Pope Gregory; however, it is figured in Father Daniel's *Histoire de France*, Vol. VIII. p. 786. On one side the king is seen, seated on his throne, trampling on the dead bodies of the slain, with the motto, "VIRTUS IN REBELLES" *(Valour against the Rebels);*

* Note to Sully's *Mémoires*, I. 27.

† See Coquerel's *Religious Art in Italy*, pp. 148, 149 (English translation).

on the other are the arms of France, surmounted by the crown, between two pillars, with the legend, "PIETAS EXCITAVIT JUSTITIAM" *(Piety hath aroused Justice)*, with the date, 24th Aug. 1572.

In the sentence pronounced against the Admiral by the Parliament of Paris, his château of Chatillon was ordered to be rased to the ground, and a brazen tablet erected, on which should be engraved a copy of the decree,—so eager was the wretched monarch to hand down to future ages the record of his ferocious perfidy.

There is a lesson to be drawn from all this, but surely no reader can require to have it pointed out.

A CRY FOR HELP FROM ONE OF OUR FAMISHED MANUFACTURING VILLAGES.

SIR,

WILL you allow me through your columns to draw the attention of the charitably disposed to the fearful destitution of the operatives in this township. Our population consists of 16,000 souls; those employed in mills, work-shops and collieries, number 6240, who support by their labour the 9000 odd, consisting of old people, women and children. At the present moment, 10,000 of these poor people are entirely destitute, and in a few days nearly every mill will be closed, and the rest will have to be supported by charity. The shopkeepers supplying food number nearly 200; most of them have exhausted their means of supplying their customers, and three-fourths of them are ruined. The savings of the more provident work-people are exhausted; their cottages, in a very large number of cases, are denuded of furniture, even to the beds; and every article of clothing which could be spared from the person has been sold to purchase food. The Board of Guardians resolutely refuses to minister sufficient aid; and had it not been for the prompt and generous aid of the Lord Mayor,* many of my unfortunate neighbours would

* The services which the Lord Mayor has rendered during his lengthened term of office, in collecting and distributing the alms of the charitable, make his mayoralty equally honourable to himself and the great city of which he is the chief magistrate. The discrimination and wisdom with which the Lord Mayor and the Mansion House Committee have distributed the funds entrusted to them for the relief of the famine in Lancashire and Cheshire are most commendable. Objections have been taken in some quarters to the existence of several channels of relief acting independently. But there is this great advantage in the multiform distribution of help, that while expediency may dictate to a local committee certain general principles in the distribution, the result will be individual cases of extreme hardship. To such cases a second relieving body, like the London Committee, may advance to give help. We earnestly trust that the Lord Mayor and his coadjutors will continue their beneficent labours and retain their independent functions. During a recent visit to the distressed districts, we heard the name of the Lord Mayor mentioned again and again with words of blessing. —ED. of C. R.

have been literally starving. The temper and spirit of the sufferers is worthy of all praise; they blame nobody, and bear their misfortunes with noble fortitude. In our house-to-house visitations, we advise all to apply for parish relief; most of them do so; but every now and then we come to a family who feel so intensely the degradation of receiving union relief, that they declare they will shut themselves up in their empty, fireless cottages and die, before this worst disaster shall overtake them. To them we are obliged to extend greater assistance than to their neighbours.

The industrial earnings of this township will probably in ordinary times not fall short of £5000 weekly; and when our mills are closed I cannot see that we can feed them for less than £1500. Half of this sum will perhaps be furnished by the guardians; how we are to raise the rest, God only knows. When raised, it will only purchase the simplest food; fuel and clothing will still be wanting; and we have not yet, whilst spending only £100 weekly, seen our way to divert our funds from food supplies. As the winter approaches, the nakedness of the people will be an additional source of misery and disease. To relieve this, I make the present appeal, in the earnest hope that some good Christian will allow his premises to be made into a depôt for receiving clothing. I would urge that there are but few who cannot contribute some cast-offs, and that our wants extend over the whole range of the wardrobe. A timely donation of clothes would enable many a poor child to resume the accustomed seat at the Sunday-school, which lately the shame of rags has denied. In conclusion, I would urge that we have peculiar claims in Dukinfield, owing to the fact that we have few resident gentry in proportion to the working population. We have no municipal institutions to attract the middle class, and consequently no machinery ready at hand to meet a crisis like the present.

Dukinfield, Sept. 17, 1862. ALFRED ASPLAND.

In giving insertion to this distressing statement, the Editor of the *Christian Reformer* desires to add one or two facts.

The writer of the letter has, from his professional and social position as a surgeon and a magistrate, the best opportunities of knowing the actual condition of his neighbours. In conjunction with Mr. Bass, the able and benevolent representative of Mr. Astley, the Lord of the Manor, and Mr. Edward Hyde, one of the principal manufacturers of the place, and some few others, he has been acting for some time on a committee of relief. The terrible destitution which rages in Dukinfield cannot possibly be met by any *local* resources. There are farmers and shopkeepers in the usual proportion, and there are large numbers of coal-miners. There is a slight sprinkling of professional men. But the bulk of the inhabitants of the township depend entirely on the cotton manufacture. They are now, by the closing of the mills, deprived of their only resource. They are surrounded by towns in much the same position, from the inhabitants of which little help is to be had. In the days of their willing and

not ill-rewarded industry, the people of Dukinfield supported their own charitable, educational and religious institutions with a liberal hand. A residence amongst them of one-and-twenty years enables the writer of this note to attest their honesty, intelligence, kindness of heart and public spirit. Such people deserve help in misfortune. To their other good qualities, many of the working people added frugality and providence. A not uncommon mode with well-to-do workmen of providing for age was the building of cottages. But the terrible and unforeseen calamity which has befallen Dukinfield and the other cotton districts makes the collection of rents impossible. The hardly-earned savings of a life of honest industry, invested in freehold cottages, are for a time without value.

The fact alluded to by our correspondent, that the want of decent clothing is now hindering children from going to school, is a sad evidence of the general distress and of its pinching character. In few places in the kingdom is education more valued than in Dukinfield. Civilization has its pride. The children and the young men and women who have hitherto crowded the Sunday-schools, have been always accustomed to decent clothing and something more. They will not face their school companions in rags. The enforced leisure they now have may be turned to good account in uninterrupted school and other instruction,* if the children, for whom there are schools not a few, can be decently clad. Shoes are particularly needed.

Now that we are within a few weeks of winter, the provision of clothing for the destitute operatives is a form of charity of pressing importance. If benevolent persons will supply materials of any kind that can be made into winter clothing, they will confer a double blessing.† Classes will be formed under suitable instruction for teaching

---

* The paragraph that follows is taken from a recent No. of the *Manchester Guardian:*

"The Committee of the Dukinfield Village Library finding that their subscribers have seriously diminished, in consequence of their inability to meet their subscriptions, have determined, until better times, to allow such subscribers to receive books out of the library free. At the annual meeting of this Institution, on Wednesday evening, Mr. Samuel Robinson recommended that free classes should be formed to give the unemployed young men in the village an opportunity during their 'enforced leisure' to improve their education."

† The letter which follows appeared lately in the *Daily News*, with the well-known initials H. M.:

The Sewing Schools.—"The other day a friend of mine went forth with £5 in her pocket, to see how much good sound clothing material she could get for that sum. I have just been looking over her package before it goes to the Blackburn Sewing School, and I find the contents to be as follows: thirteen women's gowns, seemly and serviceable; six frocks for young girls and children; six petticoats, linsey and stuff; four petticoats, woven; five flannel petticoats, very good; one child's pinafore; two boys' blouses, dark blue flannel, very good; ten women's shifts, unbleached calico; seven caps, strong muslin, checked; four bonnets, coburg, drab; a good supply of tapes, linen buttons, and hooks and eyes. It will be asked how such a purchase was achieved; and this is what I have to tell. My friend went to a shop (kept by a goodnatured tradesman, which is an important element in the case) where there was likely to be a remainder stock at the close of each season of the year. She explained her object, and was shewn remnants of flannel and calico, dresses out of fashion, out of season, or soiled (being washable), or faded. Pieces too short for a gown would serve for a frock; odd ends of stuff would make bonnets; the discarded fashions in linseys yield excellent warm petticoats very cheap. There were no cheap shawls in stock, nor

the people to make their clothes. Young women will thus be saved from all the temptations and dangers of an idle time; they will earn a small wage, and they will acquire a skill which will benefit them and their families in after and, we trust, better times. We assure our readers that articles of clothing, and materials of every kind fit for clothing, will be turned to the best account if sent to our correspondent. The most convenient plan will be for the charitably disposed to send direct to him their subscriptions and gifts of clothing and materials. His address is, *Alfred Aspland, Esq., Dukinfield, Ashton-under-Lyne.* But to aid in the good work, we add that subscriptions and clothing and materials will be received by *Rev. R. Brook Aspland*, either at 1, *Frampton Park Villas, Well Street, South Hackney*, or at the rooms of the Unitarian Association, 178, *Strand, London.* Where bundles of clothing, &c., are sent, it is desirable that they should in every case be accompanied by a letter containing a list of the articles. We undertake to publish, month by month, free of cost, the names of contributors and their gifts.

SIMPLICITY OF GOSPEL TRUTH.

No man preaches novelties and discoveries; the object of preaching is constantly to remind mankind of what mankind are constantly forgetting; not to supply the defects of human intelligence, but to fortify the feebleness of human resolutions, to recall mankind from the by-paths where they turn, into that broad path of salvation which all know, but few tread. These plain lessons the humblest ministers of the Gospel may teach, if they are honest, and the most powerful Christians will ponder, if they are wise.—*Sydney Smith.*

---

cloaks; but in a town these might probably have been obtainable. So might the list and cloth selvedges from clothiers' and woollen-drapers' shops, from which warm capes may be made, in a way which every needlewoman knows. Now there are goodnatured shopkeepers everywhere; and wherever there is a draper's shop of any consideration, there are remnants and faded and old-fashioned articles of dress. Ladies who have hours to spare can do much to serve their Lancashire sisters by trying, as my friend has done, how much they can get for £5. Fifty ladies, doing this, might go a long way towards clothing the women and children of the suffering districts. And why should there not be fifty and twice fifty ladies doing this thing within a week? I may remind them that there is little time on the spot, and little space and resource of convenience; and that, therefore, everything should be sent in readiness for the needle. The unbleached calico should be washed out; the garments should be cut out, in breadths at least, if not to fit; and each sort should be ticketed, each parcel of gowns, petticoats, &c., being separate, and ticketed with the number and quantity. It will be a great kindness to put in half-worn clothes. As I have said before—no rubbish. But there are few houses in which there are not some articles of dress which can be spared before they are nearly worn out. I will only say further, that every charge of carriage should be paid by the sender, and as little trouble given as possible. It will add a grace to the gift if everything that can be wanted is put into the parcel—linings, tape, buttons, hooks and eyes, thread, and even needles and pins. The very completeness will be a lesson to the girls, and will give pleasure in places where pleasures are very rare at present."

The writer (Miss Harriet Martineau) has sent a large contribution of materials for clothing (such as she recommends in this letter) to the Sewing School at Blackburn.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

On the Nature and some of the probable Consequences of Perfect Religious Liberty. A Sermon preached at St. Thomas's-Square Chapel, Hackney, on St. Bartholomew's Day, 1862. By the Rev. William Kirkus, LL.B. Pp. 32. London—Longmans. 1862.

Hackney, "Evangelical Hackney," as we have heard it termed by an ultra-orthodox eulogist, is one of the hot-beds of Nonconformist intolerance. Religious bigotry, avowed in the most pharisaic and unblushing manner, is the capital on which some of its parochial candidates and agitators successfully trade. If a preacher will only revile Socinians and Papists, or even the clergy of the Church of England (with a saving clause in behalf of the "Evangelical" party in the Church), he is sure to achieve a certain kind of success. But we are happy to state that the old Nonconformity of the parish is otherwise represented. No place in the latter half of the 17th century more abounded, in proportion to its population, with Nonconformists, or gave a more hospitable reception to the ejected clergy, than Hackney. Its accomplished vicar, William Spurstowe, the personal friend of Richard Baxter, laid the foundations of Protestant Nonconformity in the parish by retiring from the vicarage in 1662. During the darker days of persecution which followed, various of the ejected clergy, with more or less of secrecy, extended these foundations; and when the days of toleration and religious liberty succeeded, the accomplished Dr. William Bates built up on the foundations so well laid a large and influential Nonconformist congregation. To the successors, if not the personal descendants, of that early Nonconformist church, Mr. Kirkus, the author of the remarkable sermon before us, is the present minister. The only other Nonconformist church in Hackney which has any claims to antiquity is that of the Unitarians. The society to which Price, Priestley, Belsham and the late Robert Aspland ministered, was formed early in the last century by a seceding minority from the original Nonconformist congregation in Mare Street. The seceders represented the free theological spirit of the English Presbyterians, and the parent society lapsed to the Independents. But in freedom of thought and liberality of spirit, the present minister of St. Thomas's-Square chapel is surpassed by none. We have on a former occasion drawn attention to an able sermon of his on the Bible. Still more remarkable was the sermon preached by him on St. Bartholomew's-day.

While joining cheerfully with his Nonconformist brethren in the recognition of the virtues of the Puritan clergy, Mr. Kirkus could not conceal from himself that some portion of the admiration expressed by others had respect to their individual opinions rather than to their general principles, to the orthodox severity of their Puritanism rather than to their noble assertion of religious freedom.

A Unitarian minister, when doing homage to his Puritan ancestors, feels that there is no necessity for him to declare his non-agreement with many of their particular opinions. One in the position of Mr. Kirkus is bound by honesty to separate himself from some of the most cherished beliefs of his forerunners. In his Preface he states, as man-

fully as clearly, the views with which he approached the recent celebration of St. Bartholomew's-day.

"The controversies of our own day are very different from those of 1662. There is scarcely one of the Puritan divines with whom a dissenter of the present day would agree; we are further than ever from what they would have allowed, and certainly nearer to much for the very sake of which they seceded. Many dissenters would not only prefer *a* Liturgy, but would willingly enough accept, with scarcely a single alteration, the Book of Common Prayer; while they would all agree in rejecting the interference of the State in affairs purely ecclesiastical. * * * I found it quite impossible on St. Bartholomew's Day to pronounce any unqualified eulogy on the *opinions* of the seceding clergy of 1662; I found it equally impossible to doubt that the majority of them were brave and good men, to whom we lie under many obligations. If they could have established their own opinions, and compelled us all to submit to their rules of behaviour, we should have been bound to rebel against them; and we could scarcely have failed to regard them as among the very numerous class of well-meaning pests to mankind. Fortunately, they loved truth better than honour and power, and even life itself; *therefore*, they could serve their own generation and all mankind. The legacy they have left us is not *orthodoxy*, but *liberty*."—Pp. iii, iv.

In the sermon itself, Mr. Kirkus asserts that Nonconformists must not pledge themselves to an indiscriminate admiration of the spiritual heroes of 1662. Among the ejected clergy, he admits, were men who had been when in power persecutors, and some of whom had been guilty of cruelty equal to that from which they were doomed to suffer. Some of them, he concedes, were hypocrites, who had mistakenly thought it was for their interest to affect Puritan austerities, whether of creed, ritual or life. He spares not the memory of the unworthy ones, summing up this part of the case by the sharp but true doctrine that "at any rate cruelty and hypocrisy are as near a road to hell as any other, for Prelatist or for Puritan." But Mr. Kirkus gives us, in words of no little power, the true philosophy which the Bicentenary commemoration should teach.

"The majority, indeed, of the ejected clergy were men of singular honesty and indomitable courage; but while we remember that men of equal honesty and equal courage have suffered for conscience sake, in every section of the Church, and even outside of Christendom altogether, we must suffer them to teach us some better lesson than the validity of their own logic, and the truth of their own opinions. Tested by the courage and honour of those who have believed them, almost all opinions, however conflicting, are equally true. We must suffer holy martyrs to teach us that—whether men know the truth, and believe it, or have the misfortune to have lost their way in the labyrinth of error—it is equally their first duty, neglecting which it would be impossible for them to discharge any other, to utter boldly what they really think, and to refuse at any cost to affirm what they are unable to believe. In a word, it is not orthodoxy, but liberty, that has been bequeathed to us by those who were content to suffer rather than lie."—Pp. 11, 12.

Before entering on his general subject, Mr. Kirkus points out two indirect advantages of the recent observance by Dissenters of St. Bartholomew's-day. It rebukes the folly of those who would separate the gospel and its preaching from the general history of the world. He has evidently no sympathy with those mystics or fanatics who teach a religion which has no bearing on the daily concerns and duties of human life. He says somewhat epigrammatically, "We may very safely postpone

the preaching which concerns another world *only*, until the time when we get there."

The other advantage of the celebration is, that by it Nonconformists disavow the iconoclastic superstitions of their Puritan forefathers in respect to the service done to the Church by holy and pious men, and unite to embody the acknowledgment of that service in a religious celebration.

"The men who would have deemed it a dishonour to Him who is the Head of the Church to call any sacred edifice 'St. John's' or 'St. Paul's,' are covering the country with halls and chapels that will be called Bicentenary; which means, being interpreted, the halls and chapels of the ejected clergy of 1662. The inconsistency doubtless is very great and startling, but, like many other inconsistencies, it is worthy of our utmost respect; it is simply a return to common sense."—P. 9.

The greater portion of Mr. Kirkus's sermon is an application to the times and circumstances of our ruling sects of the great principles of intellectual liberty laid down by Mr. J. S. Mill in his masterly treatise on that subject. In a brief survey of the ecclesiastical history of England, he finds wrongdoing on every side.

"First one side was victorious, then the other; and the victor, whether right or wrong, was always a tyrant and a persecutor. The consequences were, great suffering and much sin. Wholly innocent persons, or persons, shall we say, guilty only of being honest, were imprisoned and put to death, or subjected to the scarcely more tolerable persecution of being branded with an evil reputation, and exposed to the scorn and hatred of all good men. Women and children were often turned out of their quiet homes to beg and starve; and those who wished above all things to be loyal to truth and faithful to God, were exposed to the fiercest temptations; while, on the other hand, every dominant party did its very best unconsciously to fill its chief places of honour and power with hypocrites and time-servers."—P. 14.

The lying and hypocrisy, the persecution and suffering, recorded in the history of the Church, shew that all parties have been governed by a wrong principle in their treatment of others. The preacher is led by the survey of the past to the conclusion that there is no resting-place between two extreme points,—entire submission to some infallible guide or absolute liberty. As he recognizes in his fellow-men no infallible guides, he cannot stop short of the principle that every man must be allowed to think and speak and act as he chooses, so long as he does not thereby interfere with the same liberty in other men. This liberty is of paramount importance in religion, the great fountain of thought and action, the life of human life. To those who object that this liberty is superfluous and mischievous because man has in the Bible an infallible guide, his answer is, that men are not agreed and cannot agree as to the meaning of the Bible. How unflinchingly Mr. Kirkus stands to his argument on this head, let these words shew:

"To many Christians, the mystery of the Holy Trinity is regarded as the foundation of all theology, and even of all human duty; to others, 'the Trinity' is a dogma so utterly irrational as to be incapable of verbal expression, and even absolutely unthinkable. To many, the doctrine of Atonement is essential to salvation, and directly tends to the moral purity and spiritual strength of all who believe it: in the opinion of others, it is a mischievous and demoralising fiction. And inasmuch as religion belongs not to one country only or to one state of society, but to all mankind in every age, we

must widen very much our horizon if we would know all the questions that are still, and always have been, open questions."—Pp. 17, 18.

That Mr. Kirkus is no tyro in the philosophy of free thought is sufficiently clear from the passages that follow:

"And by liberty of thought in religion I am very far from meaning the liberty to arrive only at a predetermined conclusion. Logic is as rigid in one department of truth as in another; and though we may draw a straight line from one given point to another, we cannot be certain that it shall pass through any number of other given points. In like manner, a man may determine to arrive at a particular belief, but not by the road of free enquiry and honest examination. He may determine the path *or* the end; it is by no means certain that he can determine *both*. Freedom is the best security for truth; but religious liberty implies the right to think for ourselves, even though we cannot arrive at what our neighbours consider the orthodox conclusions. * * * The liberty of thought in religion implies the right, and might seem to involve the duty, of roaming over the whole field of error and delusion. It is under no circumstances wrong to examine the opinions and arguments of those who differ from us, however extreme those opinions may be; and the stronger the arguments are by which they are defended, the more obviously does it become our duty to examine them. If we are persuaded in our own minds that a Catholic would convert us if we only heard his case fairly stated, we may be sure that our Protestantism is not worth a straw. If we think that a few 'infidel' books would upset our confidence in the Christian religion, we have every reason to suspect that we are Christians only in name. And if it be our right to think and examine freely in everything belonging to our religion, no one can be justified in calling us ill names, insulting us by his pious inuendos, or inflicting upon us any kind of annoyance or inconvenience whatever, for exercising that right. The words 'infidel,' 'sceptic,' 'rationalist,' 'neologian,' and the like, have received from religious bigotry so mischievous a connotation that they have become almost unfit for further use. They imply an infallibility on one side, and an immorality on the other, which are equally and totally imaginary. A man is not an 'infidel' simply because he does not believe what we believe; and at any rate if that were 'infidelity,' his being an infidel would be wrong only if we were infallible, and if he knew that we were."—Pp. 19—21.

Freedom of speech and discussion, Mr. Kirkus, following here in the bold track of Mr. J. S. Mill, shews is the necessary consequence of freedom of thought.

Mr. Kirkus pleads next for liberty of conduct as well as thought and speech.

"If we pass the boundaries of the sect in which we may have been brought up, we shall perceive that there is just as much difference of opinion about godly conduct as there is about the true creed. We may have been taught that it is wrong to smile on Sundays; that there is an incurable wickedness in music; and that we must suspect 'some danger nigh where we possess delight.' Fortunately, however, there are many millions of mankind who have not so much as heard of the existence of these useful rules of life. Singularly enough, the duty of honouring the perfectly good God by being extremely miserable ourselves, and insufferably disagreeable to everybody else, is not to be found among the axioms of morality!"—P. 26.

Our preacher gives a somewhat stern rebuke to the religious world for the way in which they inveigh against the amusements of other men. After quoting the words of a clergyman (Rev. Mr. Woodward), who said he should have hope for a religious man who had committed a flagrant sin—here he should remember the case of David; but in the

case of a religious man who had with all sobriety and decorum presented himself at a theatre, he should look upon him as a willing apostate beyond hope. This is Mr. Kirkus's comment:

"The sin of David was adultery and murder, *only that*. It seems, therefore, that to hear M. Fechter play Othello is a much greater sin than to kill your next-door neighbour and commit adultery with his wife. It is very fortunate that 'the world' is far too good to become religious after this fashion. The tyranny of religious bigotry is almost incredible to persons who have not been its victims; and there can be nothing like manly virtue under the dominion of this artificial and overstrained morality. Complete religious liberty includes the right to enjoy all the good gifts of God, 'giving God thanks.'"—Pp. 28, 29.

The consequences of the perfect religious liberty which our preacher advocates would be the communication of a higher tone, intellectually and morally, to social intercourse; every topic would be discussed calmly, forbearingly as to temper, but fearlessly as to results, truth being the only object sought. The diminution of sectarian bitterness might at first increase the number of sects and of those who care not to enrol themselves with any sect. But truth would grow and prevail, and men would cleave to it with confidence, knowing that it had been tried, tested and proved. In the application of his subject, Mr. Kirkus calls upon his hearers to take part with some whose names are everywhere reviled. No one will doubt whom he means by this description:

"There are divines whose names, for honesty and charity, and exceeding beauty of character, have become 'household words' among the lovers of truth and liberty, who by men of a narrower spirit are hated and reviled and persecuted, harassed and annoyed in Universities and Colleges and their own parishes, in literature and in courts of law."—P. 31.

Plainer and bolder speaking than this in the pulpit cannot be. Mr. Kirkus, at least, is not one of those to whom he refers in his concluding words, who pretend to reverence saints they will not imitate, and to denounce the tyrannies they are faithfully copying. In parting with him, we wish him God-speed! May he ever thus speak for liberty, and prove in his own future career, which cannot but be distinguished, that liberty is the sure road to truth and an assured faith, to charity of heart and godliness of life!

Macaulay versus Fox. An Inquiry into the Truthfulness of Lord Macaulay's Portraiture of George Fox. In Two Lectures. By John Stephenson Rowntree, Author of "Quakerism Past and Present." Pp. 120. London—A. W. Bennett.

Attentive readers of Macaulay's History cannot fail to remember his portraiture of George Fox—how he describes him as possessing an intellect too much disordered for liberty and not sufficiently disordered for Bedlam—as one who, judged by his own actions and writings, cannot with reason be placed above Ludowick Muggleton or Joanna Southcote.

To every man possessed of any knowledge of Quaker history and of the priceless services to the cause of humanity which the members of that mystical but amiable society have rendered, the resemblance asserted by the gifted historian between Fox and Muggleton or Southcote, would necessarily strike as unjust, and to such a degree as to give to his portrait of the Quaker founder some of the worst features of caricature. Had

George Fox's life, doctrine, writings and preaching, been merely what the historian described, the continued existence of the Society of Friends would have been a difficult problem to account for, and their great and varied excellences would have still more perplexed the thoughtful reader. To meet this difficulty the historian assigned the better influences that moulded the Society of Friends to others than Fox. He supposed that Penn and Barclay, men whom he represents as immeasurably his superiors in everything except the energy of his convictions, took upon themselves the task of polishing his rude doctrines and removing from them much that shocked common sense or offended pure taste. There are many difficulties in this theory. Some of them lie on the very surface. An ignorant fanatic, one only just too good for Bedlam, with the literature of the rudest mechanic or peasant, could not have gained converts of varied culture, or have retained their confidence and love.

Mr. Rowntree, however, has, by a reference to dates in early Quaker history, shewn that Lord Macaulay's theory is improbable. George Fox was born in 1624; William Penn was his junior by twenty years, and Robert Barclay by twenty-four years. Fox began to preach when Penn was an infant, and began those writings which in great part moulded the Quaker creed and discipline when Barclay was only a boy, and many years before the conversion of either Barclay or Penn. That George Fox was deficient in literary skill, that his writings generally needed revision before they were fit for the press, accords both with the probabilities of the case and with known facts. But the circumstance only exalts the mental and moral force of Fox's character. In defending him against Macaulay, it is not necessary to deny the literary services rendered by his two distinguished converts, or to question the fact of their helping the currency of Quaker doctrine.

Mr. Rowntree has conducted his defence of the Quaker founder with good temper and ability. He grants that Fox sometimes argued illogically, that occasionally his writings are very obscure, and that his conduct was sometimes very injudicious; but, after these concessions, argues that he was both a good and a great man. In an article which appeared in the *Christian Reformer* in 1848 (pp. 641—657), the character of George Fox and the distinguishing qualities of his religious system were drawn by one of our ablest writers, and a high rank, morally and intellectually, was assigned to the Quaker founder. Without agreeing with the view given by the writer of that instructive essay of Fox's doctrine of the inward light, we adopt unreservedly his estimate of Fox's moral worth, and with some reserve his view of his intellectual qualities. In saying this, we express our total dissent from Lord Macaulay. We give Mr. Rowntree's summary of the principal part of his second lecture:

"Lord Macaulay says George Fox was crazy; we analysed some of the supposed proofs of madness—the seeing of visions and the casting out of devils, and demonstrated, by numerous examples, that a belief in supernatural interpositions has been far from uncommon, with men eminent for wisdom and for piety. His writings are as unintelligible as corrupt Hebrew, says Lord Macaulay: we succeeded in translating into modern English, the one passage adduced in support of this statement; we also read extracts from the earliest editions of his books, and found them at least intelligible. Yet we freely allowed that, *action* rather than *authorship*, was Fox's forte. His refusal to take off his hat, and his antipathy to bowing, are said to have been dictated by the most absurd reasons. On examination we discovered, that the version

of the scene before the Chief Justice, given by Lord Macaulay, was a palpable misrepresentation of facts, the real reasons for these refusals to comply with the ordinary customs of society being very different to what was asserted—in both cases high and holy considerations, leading Fox into a line of conduct, which will be viewed variously by different persons; but one that all must allow proved his integrity of purpose, so severe was the suffering it entailed upon him. * * *

"In the historic portrait galleries of the seventeenth century—in that magnificent assembly where are ranged the likenesses of Cromwell and of Milton, of Hampden and Falkland, of Pascal, Baxter, Bunyan, Leighton, Penn, Russell, Sidney, Locke, and a host besides—let there be likewise an honest portrait of George Fox—paint him, as Cromwell insisted on being painted—with all his scars and with every wrinkle—and you will still have before you the figure of a *great* though a *humble* man—for he fervently said 'it was by the grace of God, he was what he was.'"—Pp. 101—103.

That extravagant panegyrics on Fox have been pronounced by his followers we know. Macaulay had something of the iconoclastic spirit when he saw anthing tending to intellectual or spiritual idol worship. He would in this case have best cured extravagance by drawing an exact portrait, in which the good and noble qualities of Fox were treated justly and generously. The caricature which he has drawn may render his pages more amusing to some, but it will be regarded as a serious blemish to his work by those who resort to history for instruction rather than amusement, and think justice and truth better than epigrammatic skill and the finest writing.

The True Story of the Barons of the South, or the Rationale of the American Conflict. By E. W. Reynolds. London—Whitfield.

THERE is something tempting in this title. The word *Rationale* recalled a hope which has long flown from us—that, namely, of discovering anything reasonable in the fratricidal war now raging between the Federals and the Confederates in North America. At the first we had a slender hope that the former, being earnest in anti-slavery proclivities, would openly and earnestly labour for the destruction of a sin and a shame which they themselves have found a bane and a woe. And we are still of opinion that God, making the wrath and blind passions of men to praise Him, will work out the extinction of slavery as the great, though it may be remote, result of this unjustifiable and unnatural conflict. But in that great issue the North will have as little praise as the South. Meanwhile the contest continues, and our author comes forward to explain its origin: "All our misfortunes arise from a single source, the resistance of the Southern colonies to republican government..... Popular principles and axioms are abhorrent to the inclinations of the Barons of the South." The thought (the utterance of which is due to John Adams) finds support in an "Introduction" by Rev. Samuel J. May, who says, "The Barons of the South have almost from the beginning hated democratic principles and purposes. They have foreseen and forefelt (?) the utter incompatibility of a democratic government with the permanence of their 'peculiar institution'—that worst system of tyranny —and therefore they early determined to rule or to ruin the Republic; to change its character; to make it a ruthless despotism under a better name; or else to break away from it, rend it in twain, tear it in pieces." Doubtless there is truth in this. But has the North been more favour-

able to true liberty? Beyond the small but noble circle of the Abolitionists, where in the North are we to look for genuine, earnest and consistent friends of the coloured population of North America? Besides, can any despotism be more ruthless than that which the North exercises at this moment? If the South hates republicanism, the North is in danger of rushing into military despotism, if already it is not suffering from a civil autocracy and bureaucratic dissoluteness, parallels to which are to be found only in modern Constantinople or ancient Rome. Alas! little reason now has the North to reproach the South with a love of tyranny. The great problem of self-government, which the best friends of liberty in England trusted to see worked out successfully on the western shores of the Atlantic, has come to a gigantic and most painful failure. Both North and South have plainly to learn the art of individual self-control ere either can found an empire worthy to be called Christian, or fit to produce the higher fruits of modern civilization. That slavery lies at the bottom of this utter break-down we are well assured; but never could the evil have assumed its present huge and frightful proportions had the North been faithful to its avowed principles. Like Samson, it has coquetted with Delilah till it sinks powerless in her deadly embrace. One proof of this depravity is that Mr. Reynolds declares that it is "God's ultimatum" that the slaves should be let loose on their masters. Slavery is a most hateful thing, and on that very account a servile war is the most hateful and the most terrible of wars. That calamity the South may bring upon itself; but this writer or any other person that calls for such a plague against a people, and would rather hound on the hellish fiends than allow that people to pass into the Canaan of liberty and independence for which it yearns and makes the greatest sacrifices, understands as little the principles of civil freedom as those of the gospel, and ought to hide his face from the eyes of men, lest the shame smitten into it from general indignation be too burning to be endured.

Troublous Times; or, Leaves from the Note-Book of the Rev. Mr. John Hicks, an Ejected Minister, 1670-71. Transcribed by Jane Bowring Cranch, with an Introduction by the Rev. Charles Stanford. London—Jackson, Walford and Hodder. 1862.

We learn with no little surprise, and with feelings not of pleasure, from Mr. Stanford's introductory chapter, that this work is as to its form a fiction. It is then a false pretence that the work was "transcribed" from the note-book of the ejected minister. It must then be judged as a mere tale. By confining herself to the years 1670 and 1671, the authoress stops short of the real interest of her subject. The share which Mr. Hicks took in the Monmouth rebellion, and his tragical fate on the block, at Glastonbury, and the way in which his calamity was connected with the fate of Alice L'Isle, one of the most interesting and pitiable victims of Jefferies' brutal thirst for blood,—all these facts might have afforded admirable scope for an historical novel. But Mr. Stanford tells us further that every leading incident of the tale is a well-authenticated fact, and that the authoress had drawn her materials from standard biographies and family traditions. This statement increases our surprise and regret at the course she has followed. As a history her work is valueless, while as a fiction it is clumsy. With the pure gold

of historic fact in her hands, she has debased it by stamping it with a false die.

There are some interesting facts well told in Mr. Stanford's introduction. John Hicks's Puritanism had not ejected the old Adam:

"He seems to have suffered even more than his companions from the trials of the times. For this he sometimes had reason to blame himself. It has often been remarked that every strong element in character is in danger of filling more than its due place, and of becoming error by excess. It was thus with him. He was generous, frank, and daring to a fault; apt to feel quickly, speak plainly, and act with headlong haste. On one occasion, when a warrant was out against him from the Kingsbridge justices for preaching without sanction of law, and two messengers, speaking vain-glorious and uncivil things, came to take him in charge, he did, to their great surprise, lift his cane, and after a few words of exhortation touching the right government of the tongue, proceeded to chastise them both full soundly. At their particular request, he then granted them his pardon, and departed, leaving each dignitary to find his way home, as best he might; there to tell, if it so pleased him, that he had that very night been 'robbed, murdered, and likewise put in fears of his life.'"—Pp. ix, x.

His wife was a "Mistress Howe," possibly kinswoman of good Howe, a Devonshire neighbour of John Hicks. When Hicks stood on the scaffold, he said,—

"'The care of my most dear wife and a great many children I cast upon God, who, I pray, will be better than the best of husbands unto her, and the best of fathers unto them.' They were not forsaken. It is understood that his widow found a home in the house of the youngest of his two brothers, Dr. Ralph Hicks, a physician, and that in various ways the education of his children was wisely cared for. We find that, in 1712, William, the second son, was rector of Broughton Giffard, in Wiltshire."—P. xxv.

Of his moderate, but rational and consistent Nonconformity, he gave in his last speech this account:

"I die owning my ministry and nonconformity, for which I have suffered so much, and which doth now obstruct the King's grace and mercy to me: for as I chose it not constrainedly, but clearly from the dictates of my own conscience, judging it to be the cause of God, and to have more of divine truth in it than that which is contrary thereto, so now I see no cause to repent of it, nor to recede from it, not questioning but God will own it at the last day. * * * Though I could not wade through nor conquer the difficulty (of subscription), yet I censure not those that did it; and I believe that after the hottest disputes and most vehement contests between Conformist and Nonconformist, there are of both parties who will be glorified in heaven hereafter. According to the 29th Article of the Church of England, a visible church is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, the sacraments of the Lord duly administered according to God's ordinance, and all things maintained that are requisite and necessary to salvation: so with such a church have I held the most intimate communion, and with such, did I live, would I hold it. But I would not on that account be so incorporated with any church as to exclude me from, and render me incapable of, holding communion with other churches. I was never strongly bound up to any form of ecclesiastical government, but any under which a pure and undefiled religion doth flourish, and which contains and really practises holiness, and advances the kingdom of God in the world, that can I approve of, and would willingly live under, were I to live."—Pp. xx, xxi.

A brother of the ejected minister was George Hicks, Dean of Worcester, whose Churchism was stronger than his natural affection. He was

besought to supplicate in behalf of his brother the Royal mercy, but the answer of that hard Churchman was, "I will never speak for a fanatic." But though a bigot, he was sincere, and on the accession of William and Mary declined the oath of allegiance and shared the fate of the non-jurors. He lived till 1715, and was then seventy-three years of age.

The Christianity of Christ the Religion of the Unitarian. By a Layman. Pp. 55. London—Whitfield.

This statement of the opinions of Unitarian Christians was drawn up by its intelligent author "for the information of an orthodox inquirer largely imbued with the erroneous notions so commonly entertained respecting them." It is written with simplicity and perspicuousness. The author hits, we think, on the right key-note in describing Unitarianism as *the Christianity of Christ*. He well distinguishes it in his work from the Christianity of Calvin and Athanasius. If Unitarianism is to win the minds and hearts of the people, it must do so by its being shewn that it is in accord with the doctrines of the gospel. It is not as a scheme of abstract or philosophical truth that Unitarianism will pervade the popular mind. It must be proved that it is the religion that Christ taught, and for which his apostles laboured and suffered. In an age when it is said that the laity are ceasing to care for our distinctive opinions, it is satisfactory to receive from the hands of one evidently well acquainted with Unitarianism and its grounds, this lucid and persuasive statement.

The Crucified Man. A Sermon preached in the Parish Church of Mellis, Suffolk, in the Years 1639 *and* 1651, *by Robert Harris, Rector, from* 1636 *to* 1661, *a Nonconformist of* 1662. *A Sermon for St. Bartholomew's-day,* 1862. *From the Author's MS. recently discovered in pulling down the old Rectory House of Mellis.* Edited with a Preface and Notes by the Rev. J. G. Cumming, M.A., F.G.S., Rector of Mellis, &c. Pp. 27. London—Wertheim and Co.

The publication of this pamphlet is creditable to the Rector of Mellis. It is a curious specimen of the Puritan style of preaching in the 17th century. It bespeaks its author to have been a man of learning and ability, a strong opponent of Popery, and one who looked with a jealous eye at some who ministered in those days at the altar of his own Church. He speaks in the sermon of some "who attend at the altar that they may eat of the sacrifice as Eli's sons did, and fly to the temple that they may take sanctuary in the temple as Joab did, and follow Christ if they may carry the bag as Judas did."

The sermon has its references to the fathers and its Latin quotations, and has the painful multitudinous divisions and subdivisions of that age. This sermon was preached to a little rustic flock. The population of Mellis, now under 500, could never have been large. It impresses us with the earnest character and laborious habits of the clergy of those days.

Of its author nothing whatever was known previously to the appearance of this sermon. He must not be confounded with another Puritan minister of the same name who flourished at Banbury. He was a family man; the baptismal register contains the names of several of his chil-

dren. The parish register indicates that he countenanced, if he did not take part in, the removal from the church of the organ-pipes, for which, in 1645, the town received sixteen shillings; that he also allowed certain painted windows to be removed, for which the town received £2. 3*s.*; and that he had a cross removed. These facts tell of his strong Puritan antipathies. Mr. Cumming makes no doubt that he was one of the ejected in 1662. His name is not given, nor is that of Mellis, in Calamy's account. It is a fashion with clergymen and others who resent our recent Bicentenary celebrations, to cavil at the number said to be ejected. It would seem from this pamphlet and other evidence that, in some cases, Calamy omitted to discover and record the names of the ejected. His account was composed many years after the Act of Uniformity came into operation. In small towns and villages where no Nonconformist society cherished and represented the principle of the ejected clergy, their names and history would, after a generation had passed away, be forgotten.

The circumstances which led to the discovery of the MS. from which this sermon has been printed are best told in the editor's words.

"The old Rectory House of Mellis was a frame building, filled in with stud and plaster, apparently of the date of Queen Elizabeth. It does not seem to have been inhabited by the Rectors of the parish for more than a hundred years, but was divided into two labourers' cottages, containing three rooms each, so low that a tall man could hardly stand upright in them. This old building was taken down in the early part of the present year.

"On removing the oak flooring of a chamber at the east end, a few papers were found by the workmen, seemingly concealed between the boards and the main beam. They were taken away, but the circumstance having been accidentally brought to my knowledge, I made inquiry respecting them, the result of which was the recovery of the following sermon and a sheet of paper containing a few texts of scripture with comments. On examining these I perceived at once a strong resemblance to a remarkably small and cramped handwriting which I had previously noted in the parish registers of the former part of the 17th century. A closer examination disclosed the two dates upon the sermon, March 1639, and February 1651. There is good reason also for believing the Sermon to have been preached at an earlier date than 1639, as the word 'et' (and) occurs before 'March 1639' and over it some faint writing, in which, however, I can only distingush the word 'Mellis.'"—P. 3.

The original MS., now exhibited at the publishers', "is worm-eaten, torn at the edges, and stained with water which was dropped upon it when the floor has been washed."

The editor has ingeniously supplied by conjecture many missing words. He conjectures that on the Restoration the Puritan Rector of Mellis concealed the MS. where it was recently found, and on his ejectment forgot it. It is not always that recovered MSS. are so judiciously handled, or that the public are enabled by the help of a skilful editor to read and understand them.

The Altar at Home, Second Series. Selections and Prayers for Domestic Worship. Pp. 336. Boston—Walker, Wise and Co.

This book of devotions is constructed on a somewhat new plan. It contains a long series of short homilies on practical and devotional subjects, taken partly from the Scriptures and partly from the writings of "a few of the purest and most holy men whose existence has blessed

the world." To each homily a prayer for morning use and another for evening are added. The prayers have special reference to the subject handled in the homily. This may sometimes detract from the usefulness of the volume for family worship, in which it is scarcely expedient to be limited on each occasion to some one topic. But, on the other hand, this characteristic will give the volume its own especial use, as fitting it for those who wish to turn the thoughts and devotional feelings of the family into a particular channel. Each homily is introduced by a poetical quotation. The prayers have been contributed by thirty-two well-known Unitarian clergymen of America. The names of Alger, Ames, Briggs, Brooks, Bulfinch, Bush, Clarke, Hedge, Livermore, Morison, Muzzey, Osgood, Peabody, Robbins and Walker, will be a sufficient guarantee that the standard of these devotional compositions is a high one. Some of the prayers are wanting in simplicity, and some stray too much, for our taste, into disquisition. But generally the work is excellently done, and for occasional use may be unhesitatingly recommended to all who wish the offerings of the "altar at home" to be in harmony with exalted religious ideas and with true devotion of the heart.

Church Song, in its Relations to Church Life. By Rev. Henry Allon. Pp. 103. Nesbitt and Co.

THIS, one of the Exeter-Hall Lectures of the present season, is a very well-executed essay on the history and characteristics of church music. The text is illustrated by the score of some choice specimens of church song, which are worth double the cost of the pamphlet. We sincerely thank Mr. Allon for his judicious and elegant plea for the use of the best music in our religious worship. We are glad to have an opportunity of mentioning with honour the name of this respectable Dissenting minister, because on a recent occasion a great but unintentional injustice was done him by many of the newspapers (our own amongst the rest) attributing to him an expression of bigoted feeling of which we believe him to be incapable.

---

1. *How did they get there? Or the Nonconforming Ministers of* 1662. *A Question for those who would celebrate the Bicentenary of St. Bartholomew's-day*, 1662. By the Rev. George Venables, S.C.L., F.R.A.S., Incumbent of Christ Church, Friesland, Yorkshire. Pp. 32. London —Wertheim.
2. *I'll tell you. An Answer to "How did they get there?" A Tractate touching the Ejected of* 1662. By Robert Vaughan, D.D. Pp. 31. London—Jackson, Walford and Hodder.

THESE pamphlets are worth reading. The first is a clerical attack on the Nonconformist Bicentenary position, conducted with some appearance of historical knowledge, and with rather less calling of bad names than in some other clerical pamphlets and lectures on similar subjects. Dr. Vaughan's reply gives us a series of lucid historical statements which all may advantageously read. His conclusion is that the persecuting laws of 1662, and the years immediately following, "were all embodiments of a bigotry wholly without excuse, and of a wanton disposition to oppress. All were called into existence and persisted in from no necessity, but purely for the pleasure of seeing the weak crushed by the strong."

INTELLIGENCE.

OBSERVANCE OF ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S-DAY.

The recurrence, after an interval of two hundred years, of the anniversary of the ejection of the Two Thousand clergy, was celebrated by appropriate religious services in almost every town and considerable village in the kingdom. It is a very remarkable circumstance that few traces exist of the day having been particularly observed on the centenary anniversary,—the more so as during a considerable portion of the last century it was the custom of some of the Presbyterian ministers to mark *Black Bartholomew's-day* by a sermon. The second century of Protestant Nonconformity in England has given it a vigour and an outspokenness which did not characterize it a hundred years ago.

The animation of the religious and other observance of the recent St. Bartholomew's-day was somewhat increased by an unexpected infusion of the controversial spirit. Some of the "Evangelical" clergy had chosen to resent the proceedings of their Nonconformist neighbours, and to interpret everything said and done in reference to the celebration as an intended attack on the Church Establishment and themselves. They raised a little army of Church lecturers, and they put out declarations and delivered lectures designed to carry the war into the Dissenting camp. Their proceedings were, however, carried on with more zeal and temper than knowledge or ability, and only served to give a better vantage-ground to the Nonconformist leaders.

Some of the more excitable of the clergy used the noted Festival of their Church which fell on Aug. 24th, as an opportunity of glorifying the Establishment and celebrating the exclusion from it in 1662 of certain troublesome Puritan elements. Such injudicious advocates made themselves thereby responsible for that great ecclesiastical blunder which was perpetrated by Clarendon and his spiritual advisers subsequent to the Restoration, which has been admitted and lamented by many of the best friends of the Church, and the evil consequences of which exist to the present hour, and are probably now actively germinating and producing much internal weakness in the Church. Churchmen unquestionably have a case as against those Dissenters who use this anniversary year simply as a means of attack against the Church. They can state and make good a case in which their clerical forefathers were persecuted and ejected. In some instances the clerical agitators have been enabled to gain an apparent victory over their opponents in this matter, but it has only been when the latter have dealt uncandidly with English history by concealing the intolerance and persecution practised by the Puritan party when in power. Clergymen have as much right to magnify the honest and true men of their Church as Nonconformists have to do honour to the Two Thousand. But in truth there ought to be no party spirit in this matter, and clerical integrity and courage under persecution ought to be respected and honoured alike in friend and foe.

Some of the early Nonconformist celebrations of the year were not free from another fault. There was a disposition on the part of some of the Calvinistic Dissenters to make theological capital out of the occasion, and to draw attention rather to the particular opinions of the ejected clergy than to their general principles and their integrity of purpose. This was a blunder in polemic strategics. The clerical critics were enabled to attack the Nonconformists in their flank, and to deny altogether their right to celebrate the anniversary on this principle. They argued, and correctly enough, that on innumerable questions modern Dissenters are not in agreement with the early English Nonconformists. They differed entirely from those Dissenters who oppose an Establishment on principle. In 1650, the Puritans did everything in their power to make a religious establishment according to their own ideas; and in 1662, and for years after, there were but few of the Two Thousand who did not eagerly desire to be comprehended in the Establishment, from which conscience and a rigid Act of Uniformity ejected them. We have felt it right to notice these occasional blots in the recent celebration; but having done so, we can add that as a whole the celebration has been conducted in a very becoming manner. Probably no occasion in our national history has better served to illustrate the numbers, zeal and union and pecuniary resources of the "orthodox" Dissenters. They have been led with decision and ability, and they have generally followed the leading of the masters of their Israel. The Unitarian body have their own thoughts and ways on such occasions. They are not in the habit of recognizing any leaders. Each church walks its own way, and often every individual in a church chalks out his own path. There has therefore been among

us no united effort to glorify the Bicentenary anniversary. But much more has been done and is still doing than generally appears. Some of our older societies have taken the opportunity of effecting some congregational object,—a debt has been paid off, a school-room has been built, or some memorial more or less appropriate has been devised and carried into effect. We have no objection to this. It is the necessary consequence of that right of private judgment which we claim and practise. We blame no man for not agreeing with us as to the best mode of celebrating the anniversary; if we have the right and the disposition to censure anywhere, it is where the propriety of the celebration is admitted, but every suggested mode is censured and no better alternative is devised. One fact connected with the recent celebration is worthy of observation—the very general respect with which it has been treated by the press. The *Quarterly Review*, the *Saturday Review*, the *Athenæum* and a few Church periodicals (with their "forty-parson power" of wit, wisdom and Christian charity), stand out in this matter in bold contrast to the English press. The appropriateness of the celebration has been generally recognized, and the press, both in the metropolis and the provinces, has been forward to give publicity to the discourses of the leaders of Protestant Nonconformity. If in too many quarters there has been an indisposition among the orthodox Dissenters to invite or even accept the co-operation of Unitarians, the English press, with its habitual fairness, has not sympathized with the narrow feeling. Columns upon columns of Unitarian sermons were printed in the country newspapers during the week which followed the 24th of August. On the day before the anniversary, the *Times* newspaper made it the subject of its principal leader, written in a tone of moderation and good sense. We extract a paragraph from the article. There are references in it to the Address of the United (orthodox) Committee, signed by Sir Morton Peto, Mr. Morley and others,—a very commendable document, for which we regret we have not space.

"To-morrow is the Bicentenary of this Exodus, and the Nonconformists of the country are invited to celebrate it with a hearty sympathy for the sufferings of the expelled clergy, a deep admiration for their heroism, and a qualified respect for their opinions and their cause. An advertisement in our columns—very moderate in its tone and most reasonable in its views—has for some time reminded British Dissenters of the approaching anniversary. Centenaries and Bicentenaries have been celebrated on much less occasion. The spectacle of 2000 men resigning their worldly position in the cause of truth is one that should not be forgotten. It has not been forgotten, nor has time dimmed its lustre or obscured its features. As we are forcibly reminded in the paper to which we refer, that great act of resignation has told powerfully on the English character, on the freedom of religion and opinion in this country, on our spirit of inquiry, our independence of judgment, and the determination with which all classes act up to their religious convictions. It is admitted that the 2000 Nonconformists, while resisting, one may say, unto death Prelacy and the Prayer-book, stood out for a form of government and a directory only less offensive to other equally conscientious men. So it is not the doctrine, or the system, or the government, or any particular that is to be commemorated and ennobled to-morrow. It is the broad feature of a great protest against spiritual tyranny, and temporal dictation in matters of conscience. In this all sects can agree; and when the Church of England remembers the St. Bartholomew's-day of 1572, it, too, for once, can join hands with the Dissenter."

We had proposed to describe the different ways in which our Unitarian churches have celebrated this anniversary, but we had no anticipation when making the proposal that the occasion would be so universally marked, or that we should have been so overwhelmed by materials. Were we to carry out our purpose, we must devote half our No. to the subject, and should then find ourselves only reprinting much that has appeared in other journals. We must content ourselves, therefore, with stating that in nearly every Unitarian pulpit in the kingdom, Bicentenary sermons or addresses have been given, and that in many places meetings having the same object in view were held. The spirit evinced was generally that which became the preachers and the occasion. The ejected clergy were honoured, not for their particular opinions, but for their integrity and faithful courage. History was not misrepresented, and in some cases valuable local history, illustrating the rise of Nonconformity, was embodied in the sermon or the address.

We have only, in conclusion, to express to those correspondents who have favoured us with sermons and MS. narratives, as well as that larger number who have supplied us with copies of newspaper reports, our regret that the very affluence of their help has prevented our making use of it. Of those who collect congregational

histories, we would direct their attention to two excellent pamphlets published at Newcastle-on-Tyne; one, by Mr. James Clephan, giving a sketch of Nonconformity in that town; the other, by Mr. Samuel Charlesworth, entitled, "Lessons and Reflections suggested by the Bicentenary of Nonconformity." We have in our Critical Notices directed attention to a sermon by Mr. Kirkus; and we would further mention two admirable sermons by Rev. Thos. Binney, one preached on the Farewell Sunday (Aug. 17), the other on St. Bartholomew's-day. In truthfulness and the Christian spirit they are alike commendable.

OBITUARY.

Aug. 10, at Moreton Hampstead, aged 74, Mr. WILLIAM MARDON.

In him the Unitarian congregation have lost a sincere and useful member. He was always deeply interested in everything that concerned its welfare, being attached to the cause both by principle and descent. His was one of the many names connected with the congregation from its earliest records that are or will be lost to it in the course of a few years.

He filled the office of librarian to the congregation nearly forty years, and during the declining years of the late Rev. J. Smethurst occasionally conducted the services, if Mr. Smethurst was unable and no minister could be obtained.

Mr. Mardon was universally respected, and much sympathy was expressed with the only surviving member of his family at his unexpected removal, after only a week of serious illness.

In every relation of life he was most worthy, and though but in the very moderate circumstances of a country tradesman, many have reason to thank him for kindness that has been of great service to them. Always self-denying, he was most thoughtful and considerate to those around him.

He met some heavy trials with calmness, resignation and fortitude. The few talents Providence entrusted to his care were most conscientiously used. He was one, as far as we can judge, who might be called a good and faithful servant, and who, let us hope, has entered into the joy of his Lord.

Aug. 17, at Colyton Cottage, Devon, in her 75th year, CATHERINE, widow of Commander George Eyre POWELL, R.N. Mrs. Powell was for thirty-six years a zealous and consistent supporter of the Unitarian cause in the town.

Aug. 17, at Exeter, HERBERT GORE, youngest son of Mr. and Mrs. DINGLE.

Aug. 27, at Garden Street, Morice Town, Devonport, MARY, eldest daughter of the late Mr. Sylvanus GIBBS, in the 55th year of her age.

Aug. 27, Mr. THOMAS BLUNN, of Catcliffe, near Rotherham, aged 42 years.

Sept. 3, aged 56 years, JULIA CATHERINE, wife of Mr. John ROWLINSON, of Liverpool.

Sept. 9, in the 70th year of his age, BENJAMIN SYDDALL, Esq., silk manufacturer, of Manchester.

Sept. 13, at her residence, West Hill, Wandsworth, SARAH, widow of the late G. R. PORTER, Esq., of the Board of Trade, in her 72nd year.

MARRIAGES.

Sept. 3, at Hyde chapel, Gee Cross, by Rev. R. Brook Aspland, M.A., father of the bridegroom, Mr. ARTHUR PALMER ASPLAND, of Hyde, Cheshire, to SARAH, elder daughter of Mr. Edward HIBBERT, of Springbank, Godley.

Sept. 17, at Hawkshead church, by Rev. H. Baines, Mr. T. LINDSEY ASPLAND, of Sawrey, to ELLEN, daughter of the late Mr. Thomas COWBURN, of Liverpool.

Sept. 18, at Newington-Green chapel, by Rev. Dr. Cromwell, A. GORING, eldest son of Andrew PRITCHARD, Esq., of St. Paul's Road, Canonbury, to MARIANNE, eldest daughter of William TITFORD, Esq., of Richmond House, Highbury New Park.

Sept. 25, at the Unitarian church, Hackney, by Rev. R. Brook Aspland, M.A., Mr. JOHN NEWTON, of Stalybridge, to FRANCES CAROLINE, eldest daughter of the late John MORTIMER, Esq., of Albion Square, Dalston, London.